THEOLOGICAL DICTIONARY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

Edited by
G. Johannes Botterweck
Helmer Ringgren
Heinz-Josef Fabry

VOLUME XII

Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament
Volume 12
Translated from
Theologisches Wörterbuch zum alten Testament
Band VI, Lieferungen 6-11
Published 1988-1989 by
Verlag W. Kohlhammer GmbH, Stuttgart, Germany

Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.
255 Jefferson Ave. S.E., Grand Rapids, Michigan 49503 /
P.O. Box 163, Cambridge CB3 9PU U.K.

Printed in the United States of America

09 08 07 06 05 04 03 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Botterweck, G. Johannes
Theological dictionary of the Old Testament
Translation of Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament.
Translated by David E. Green and Douglas W. Stott
Includes rev. ed. of v. 1-2.
Includes bibliographical references.
1. Bible. O.T. — Dictionaries — Hebrew. 2. Hebrew language — Dictionaries — English.
I. Ringgren, Helmer, 1917 — joint author. II. Fabry, Heinz-Josef — joint author.
III. Title.
ISBN 0-8028-2338-6 (set)

Volume XII ISBN 0-8028-2336-X

www.eerdmans.com

CONTENTS

Abbreviations

AAAS	*Annales archéologiques Arabes Syriennes,* Damascus
AANLR	*Atti dell'Academia Nazionale dei Lincei, Rendiconti,* Rome
AAWLM.G	*Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literature in Mainz,* Geistes- und sozialwissenschaftliche Klasse, Wiesbaden
AB	*Anchor Bible,* ed. W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman, Garden City, N.Y.
ABL	R. F. Harper, *Assyrian and Babylonian Letters,* 14 vols. (Chicago, 1892-1914)
ABLAK	M. Noth, *Aufsätze zur biblischen Landes- und Altertumskunde,* 2 vols. (Neukirchen, 1971)
ABR	*Australian Biblical Review,* Melbourne
abs.	absolute
acc.	accusative
AcOr	*Acta orientalia,* Copenhagen, Leiden
act.	active
AcThD	*Acta theologica danica,* Århus, Copenhagen
adj.	adjective
adv.	adverb, adverbial
AfO	*Archiv für Orientforschung,* Graz
ÄgAbh	*Ägyptologische Abhandlungen,* Wiesbaden
AHAW	*Abhandlungen der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften,* Heidelberg
AHw	W. von Soden, *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch,* 3 vols. (Wiesbaden, 1965-81)
AION	*Annali dell'Istituto Universitario Orientali di Napoli*
AJBI	*Annual of the Japanese Biblical Institute,* Tokyo
AJSL	*American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature*
AKG	*Archiv für Kulturgeschichte,* Berlin
Akk.	Akkadian
AKM	*Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes,* Leipzig, Wiesbaden, Hildesheim
Amhar.	Amharic
Amor.	Amorite
AnAcScFen	*Annales Academiae Scientarum Fennicae,* Helsinki
AnBibl	*Analecta biblica,* Rome
AncIsr	R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions* (Eng. trans., New York, 1961, repr. 1965)
ANEP	*Ancient Near East in Pictures,* ed. J. B. Pritchard (Princeton, ²1955, ³1969)
ANET	*Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the OT,* ed. J. B. Pritchard (Princeton, ²1955, ³1969)
ANH	G. Dalman, *Aramäisch-Neuhebräisches Handwörterbuch,* Göttingen, ²1922, ³1938
AnOr	*Analecta orientalia,* Rome
AO	*Tablets in the collection of the Musée de Louvre,* Paris
AOAT	*Alter Orient und AT,* Kevelaer, Neukirchen-Vluyn
AOS	*American Oriental Series,* New Haven
AOT	*Altorientalische Texte zum AT,* ed. H. Gressmann (Berlin, ²1926, repr. 1953)

AP A. E. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* (1923, repr. Osnabrück, 1976)
APN K. Tallqvist, *Assyrian Personal Names. ASSF* 43/1 (1914, repr. 1966)
APNM H. B. Huffmon, *Amorite Personal Names in the Mari Texts* (Baltimore, 1965)
app. (textual/critical) apparatus
Arab. Arabic
Aram. Aramaic
ARM *Archives royales de Mari. Textes cunéiformes,* Paris
ArOr *Archiv orientální,* Prague
ARW *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft,* Freiburg, Leipzig, Berlin
AS *Assyriological Studies,* Chicago
ASAE *Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte,* Cairo
ASSF *Acta Societatis Scientiarum Fennicae*
Assyr. Assyrian
ASTI *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute in Jerusalem,* Leiden
AT Altes Testament, Ancien Testament, etc.
ATA *Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen,* Münster
ATANT *Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments,* Zurich
ATD *Das AT Deutsch,* ed. V. Herntrich and A. Weiser, Göttingen
ATDA J. Hoftijzer and G. van der Kooij, *Aramaic Texts from Deir 'Alla* (Leiden, 1976)
ATR *Anglican Theological Review,* Evanston
ATS *Arbeiten zu Text und Sprache im AT,* St. Ottilien, Munich
AuS G. Dalman, *Arbeit und Sitte in Palästina,* 7 vols. (1928-42, repr. Hildesheim, 1964)
AUSS *Andrews University Seminary Studies,* Berrien Springs, Mich.
AzT *Arbeiten zur Theologie,* Stuttgart
BA *Biblical Archaeologist,* New Haven, Ann Arbor, Philadelphia, Atlanta
Bab. Babylonian, Babylonian Talmud
BAfO *Beiheft zur AfO*
BAR *Biblical Archaeology Review,* Washington, D.C.
BA Reader *Biblical Archaeologist Reader,* ed. D. N. Freedman et al., 3 vols. (1961-70, repr. Winona Lake, Ind., 1975), vol. 4 (Sheffield, 1983)
BASOR *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research,* New Haven, Ann Arbor, Philadelphia, Baltimore
BB *Biblische Beiträge*
BBB *Bonner biblische Beiträge*
BDB F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the OT* (Oxford, 1907; Peabody, Mass., ^{2}1979)
Beeston A. F. L. Beeston, et al., *Sabaic Dictionary* (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1982)
Benz F. L. Benz, *Personal Names in the Phoenician and Punic Inscriptions. StPohl* 8 (1972)
BeO *Bibbia e oriente,* Milan
BethM *Beth Miqra,* Jerusalem
BETL *Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum Lovaniensium,* Paris, Gembloux
BEvT *Beiträge zur evangelische Theologie,* Munich
Beyer K. Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer* (Göttingen, 1984)
BHHW *Biblisch-historisches Handwörterbuch,* ed. L. Rost and B. Reicke, 4 vols. (Göttingen, 1962-66; index and maps, 1979)
BHK *Biblia hebraica,* ed. R. Kittel (Stuttgart, ^{3}1929)
BHS *Biblia hebraica stuttgartensia,* ed. K. Elliger and W. Rudolph (Stuttgart, 1966-77)
BHT *Beiträge zur historischen Theologie,* Tübingen

Bibl	*Biblica,* Rome
bibliog.	bibliography
Biella	J. Biella, *Dictionary of Old South Arabic, Sabaean Dialect. HSS* 25 (1982)
BietOr	*Biblica et orientalia,* Rome
BIFAO	*Bulletin de l'institut français d'archéologie orientale,* Cairo
BiKi	*Bibel und Kirche,* Stuttgart
BiLe	*Bibel und Leben,* Düsseldorf
BiLi	*Bibel und Liturgie,* Klosterneuberg
BiOr	*Bibliotheca orientalis,* Leiden
BJRL	*Bulletin of the John Rylands Library,* Manchester
BK	*Biblischer Kommentar AT,* ed. M. Noth and H. W. Wolff, Neukirchen-Vluyn
BL	*Bibel-Lexikon,* ed. H. Haag (Einsiedeln, 1951, [2]1968)
BLe	H. Bauer and P. Leander, *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des ATs* (1918-22, repr. Hildesheim, 1991)
BMAP	E. G. Kraeling, *Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyri* (New Haven, 1953)
BN	*Biblische Notizen,* Bamberg
Bo	*Bogazköy: Istanbul and Berlin inventory*
BOT	*De Boeken van het OT,* Roermond en Maaseik
BR	*Biblical Research,* Chicago
BRL	K. Galling, *Biblisches Reallexikon. HAT* (1937, [2]1977)
BS	*Bibliotheca sacra,* Dallas
BSAW	*Berichte der Sachsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften,* Leipzig
BSOAS	*Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies,* London
BSt	*Biblische Studien,* Neukirchen-Vluyn
BT	*Bible Translator,* London
BTB	*Biblical Theology Bulletin,* Rome
BThS	*Biblisch-theologische Studien,* Neukirchen-Vluyn
BVC	*Bible et vie chrétienne,* Paris
BWA(N)T	*Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten (und Neuen) Testament,* Leipzig, Stuttgart
BWL	W. G. Lambert, *Babylonian Wisdom Literature* (Oxford, 1960)
BZ	*Biblische Zeitschrift,* Paderborn
BZAW	*Beihefte zur ZAW,* Berlin
BZNW	*Beihefte zur ZNW,* Giessen, Berlin
ca.	circa, about
CAD	*Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago* (1956–)
CahRB	*Cahiers de la RB,* Paris
Can.	Canaanite
CAT	*Commentaire de l'AT,* Neuchâtel
CBNT	*Coniectanea biblica, NT Series,* Lund
CBOT	*Coniectanea biblica, OT Series,* Lund
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly,* Washington
CBQMS	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series*
CD A,B	Damascus document, manuscript A, B
cf.	compare, see
ch(s).	chapter(s)
CH	Code of Hammurabi
ChW	J. Levy, *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Targumim und einen grossen Theil des rabbinischen Schriftthums,* 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1867-68, repr. 1959)
CIJ	*Corpus inscriptionum judicarum* (Vatican, 1936–)
CIL	*Corpus inscriptionum latinarum* (Berlin, 1862–)

CIS	*Corpus inscriptionum semiticarum* (Paris, 1881–)
cj.	conjecture
CML	G. R. Driver, *Canaanite Myths and Legends* (Edinburgh, 1956; [2]1978, ed. J. C. L. Gibson)
col.	column
comm(s).	commentary(ies)
Conc	*Concilium. Internationale Zeitschrift für Theologie,* Einsiedeln
const.	construct
ContiRossini	C. Conti Rossini, *Chrestomathia arabica meridionalis epigraphica* (Rome, 1931)
Copt.	Coptic
CPT	J. Barr, *Comparative Philology and the Text of the OT* (Oxford, 1968)
CRAI	*Comptes rendus des séances de l'Academie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres,* Paris
CSD	R. Payne Smith, *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary* (Oxford, 1903, repr. 1976)
CTA	A. Herdner, *Corpus des tablettes en cunéiformes alphabétiques découvertes à Ras Shamra-Ugarit,* 2 vols. (Paris, 1963)
CThM	*Calwer theologische Monographien,* Stuttgart
CV	*Communio viatorum*
D	Deuteronomist source
D	D (doubling) stem
DAWB	*Deutsch Akademie der Wissenschaft zu Berlin. Schriften der Sektion für Altertumswissenschaft*
DB	*Dictionnaire de la Bible,* ed. F. Vigouroux (Paris, 1895-1912)
DBAT	*Dielheimer Blätter zum AT*
DBS	*Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplement,* ed. L. Pirot et al. (Paris, 1926–)
diss.	dissertation
DJD	*Discoveries in the Judean Desert* (Oxford, 1955–)
DMOA	*Documenta et monumenta orientis antiqui,* Leiden
DN	deity name
DNSI	J. Hoftijzer and K. Jongeling, *Dictionary of North-West Semitic Inscriptions,* 2 vols. (Leiden, 1995)
Dtn	Deuteronomic source
Dtr	Deuteronomistic source
DtrN	nomistic Deuteronomistic source
DtrP	prophetic Deuteronomistic redactor
DTT	Dansk teologisk Tidsskrift, Copenhagen
E	Elohistic source
EA	Tell el-Amarna tablets
EB	*Die Heilige Schrift in deutscher Übersetzung. Echter-Bibel,* Würzburg
ÉBib	*Études bibliques,* Paris
ed.	edition, editor
EdF	*Erträge der Forschung,* Darmstadt
EDNT	*Exegetical Dictionary of the NT,* ed. H. Balz and G. Schneider, 3 vols. (Eng. trans., Grand Rapids, 1990-93)
EgT	*Église et Théologie*
Egyp.	Egyptian
EH	*Europäische Hochschulschriften,* Frankfurt, Bern
EHAT	*Exegetisches Handbuch zum AT,* Münster
EMiqr	*Enṣiqlōpedyā miqrā'it (Encyclopedia Biblica),* (Jerusalem, 1950–)
emph.	emphatic(us)

EncBib	*Encyclopaedia Biblica,* ed. T. K. Cheyne, 4 vols. (London, 1900-1903, repr. 1958)
EncJud	*Encyclopaedia judaica,* 16 vols. (Jerusalem, New York, 1971-72)
EnEl	Enuma Elish
Eng.	English
ERE	*Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics,* ed. J. Hastings, 13 vols. (New York, 1913-27)
Erg.	Ergänzungsheft, Ergänzungsreihe
ErIsr	*Eretz-Israel,* Jerusalem
esp.	especially
EstBíb	*Estudios bíblicos,* Madrid
Eth.	Ethiopic
ETL	*Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses,* Louvain
ETR	*Études théologiques et religieuses,* Montpellier
ETS	*Erfurter theologische Studien,* Erfurt
EÜ	Einheitsübersetzung der Heilige Schrift (Stuttgart, 1974-80)
Even-Shoshan	A. Even-Shoshan, *New Concordance of the Bible* (Jerusalem, [4]1983)
EvT	*Evangelische Theologie,* Munich
ExpT	*Expository Times,* Edinburgh
fasc.	fascicle
fem.	feminine
fig(s).	figure(s)
fr(s).	fragment(s)
FRLANT	*Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments,* Göttingen
FS	*Festschrift*
FThS	*Frankfurter theologische Studien,* Frankfurt am Main
FuF	*Forschungen und Fortschritte,* Berlin
FzB	*Forschung zur Bibel,* Würzburg
G	basic *(Grund)* stem
GaG	W. von Soden, *Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik. AnOr* 33 (1952, [2]1969 [with Erg., *AnOr* 47])
Ger.	German
GesB	W. Gesenius and F. Buhl, *Hebräisches und aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das AT* (Berlin, [17]1921, [18]1987–)
GesTh	W. Gesenius, *Thesaurus philologicus criticus linguae hebraecae et chaldaeae Veteris Testamenti,* 3 vols. (Leipzig, 1829-58)
Gilg.	Gilgamesh epic
Gk.	Greek
GK	W. Gesenius and E. Kautsch, *Hebräische Grammatik* (Halle, [28]1909) (= Kautsch and A. E. Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar* [Oxford, [2]1910])
GM	*Göttingen Miszellen. Beiträge zur ägyptologischen Diskussion*
GSAT	*Gesammelte Studien zum AT,* Munich
GTA	*Göttinger theologische Arbeiten*
GTT	*Gereformeerd theologisch Tijdschrift,* Aalten, Kampen
GTTOT	J. J. Simons, *Geographical and Topographical Texts of the OT. SFS* 2 (1959)
GUOST	*Glasgow University Oriental Society Transactions,* Glasgow
H	Holiness Code
Habil.	Habilitationschrift
HAL	L. Koehler, W. Baumgartner et al., *Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the OT,* 5 vols. plus Sup (Eng. trans., Leiden, 1967-96)
HAR	*Hebrew Annual Review,* Columbus, Ohio

HAT	*Handbuch zum AT,* ser. 1, ed. O. Eissfeldt, Tübingen
HDB	*Dictionary of the Bible,* ed. J. Hastings, 4 vols. (Edinburgh, 1898-1902; *Sup,* 1904; New York, ^{2}1963)
Heb.	Hebrew
Herm	*Hermeneia,* Philadelphia, Minneapolis
Hitt.	Hittite
HKAT	*Handkommentar zum AT,* ed. W. Nowack, Göttingen
HO	*Handbuch der Orientalistik,* Leiden
HP	E. Jenni, *Das hebräische Pi'el* (Zurich, 1968)
HS	*Die Heilige Schrift des ATs,* ed. F. Feldmann and H. Herkenne, 8 vols. (Bonn, 1930-31)
HSAT	*Die Heilige Schrift des ATs,* ed. E. Kautsch and A. Bertholet, 4 vols. (Tübingen, ^{4}1922-23)
HSM	*Harvard Semitic Monographs,* Cambridge, Mass.
HSS	*Harvard Semitic Series/Studies,* Cambridge, Missoula, Chico, Atlanta
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review,* Cambridge, Mass.
HTS	*Harvard Theological Studies,* Cambridge, Mass.
HUCA	*Hebrew Union College Annual,* Cincinnati
Hurr.	Hurrian
IB	*Interpreter's Bible,* ed. G. A. Buttrick, 12 vols. (Nashville, 1952-57)
ICC	*International Critical Commentary,* Edinburgh
IDB	*Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible,* ed. G. A. Buttrick, 4 vols. (Nashville, 1962); *Sup,* ed. K. Crim (Nashville, 1976)
IEJ	*Israel Exploration Journal,* Jerusalem
ILC	J. Pedersen, *Israel: Its Life and Culture,* 4 vols. in 2 (Eng. trans., Oxford, 1926-40, ^{5}1963)
ill(s).	illustration(s)
ILR	*Israel Law Review,* Jerusalem
Imp.	Imperial
impf.	imperfect
impv.	imperative
inf.	infinitive
in loc.	on this passage
Int	Interpretation, Richmond
Intro(s).	Introduction(s) (to the)
IPN	M. Noth, *Die israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der gemeinsemitischen Namengebung. BWANT* 46[III/10] (1928, repr. 1980)
ISBE	*International Standard Bible Encyclopedia,* ed. G. W. Bromiley, et al., rev. ed. (Grand Rapids, 1979-89)
J	Yahwist source (J^1, earliest Yahwist source)
JA	*Journal asiatique,* Paris
JAAR	*Journal of the American Academy of Religion*
JAC	*Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum,* Münster
JANES	*Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University,* New York
JAOS	*Journal of the American Oriental Society,* Baltimore, Boston, New Haven
JARCE	*Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt,* Boston
Jastrow	M. Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* (1903; repr. 2 vols. in 1, Brooklyn, 1975)
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature,* Philadelphia, Missoula, Chico, Atlanta
JCS	*Journal of Cuneiform Studies,* New Haven, Cambridge, Mass., Philadelphia, Baltimore
JE	Yahwist-Elohist source

Jer.	Jerusalem (Palestinian) Talmud
JJS	*Journal of Jewish Studies,* London
JM	P. Joüon and T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew. Subsidia biblica* 14/I-II (Eng. trans. 1991)
JNES	*Journal of Near Eastern Studies,* Chicago
JNSL	*Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages,* Stellenbosch
JPOS	*Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society,* Jerusalem
JQR	*Jewish Quarterly Review,* Philadelphia
JR	*Journal of Religion,* Chicago
JSHRZ	*Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit,* Gütersloh
JSJ	*Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period,* Leiden
JSOT	*Journal for the Study of the OT,* Sheffield
JSOTSup	*Journal for the Study of the OT, Supplement,* Sheffield
JSS	*Journal of Semitic Studies,* Manchester
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies,* Oxford
Jud	*Judaica,* Zurich
K	*Kethibh*
KAI	H. Donner and W. Röllig, *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften,* 3 vols. (Wiesbaden, [2]1966-69, [3]1971-76)
KAT	*Kommentar zum AT,* ed. E. Sellin and J. Herrmann, Leipzig, Gütersloh
KBL	L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros* (Leiden, [1]1953, [2]1958, [3]1967–96)
KD	C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, *Comm. on the OT,* 10 vols. (Eng. trans., repr. Grand Rapids, 1954)
KEHAT	*Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum AT,* ed. O. F. Fridelin (Leipzig, 1812-96)
KHC	*Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum AT,* ed. K. Marti, Freiburg/Leipzig/Tübingen
KlL	*Kleine Lichter*
KlPauly	*Der Kleine Pauly. Lexikon der Antike,* ed. K. Ziegler and W. Sontheimer, 5 vols. (Stuttgart, 1962-75)
KlSchr	*Kleine Schriften* (A. Alt [Munich, 1953-59, [3]1964]; O. Eissfeldt [Tübingen, 1962-79]; K. Elliger [*ThB* 32 (1966)]; E. Meyer [Halle, 1910-24])
König	E. König, *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Wörterbuch zum AT* (Leipzig, 1910; [6,7]1937)
KTU	*Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit,* I, ed. M. Dietrich, O. Loretz, and J. Sanmartín. *AOAT* 24 (1976)
KuD	*Kerygma und Dogma,* Göttingen
Kuhn	K. G. Kuhn, *Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten* (Göttingen, 1960); Nachträge, *RevQ* 4 (1963-64) 163-234
l(l).	line(s)
Lane	E. W. Lane, *An Arabic-English Lexicon,* 8 vols. (London, 1863-93, repr. 1968)
LAPO	*Littératures anciennes du Proche-Orient,* Paris
Lat.	Latin
LCL	*Loeb Classical Library,* Cambridge, Mass., and London
LD	*Lectio divina,* Paris
Leslau, *Contributions*	W. Leslau, *Ethiopic and South Arabic Contributions to the Hebrew Lexicon* (Los Angeles, 1958)
Leš	*Lešonénu,* Jerusalem
LexÄg	W. Helck and E. Otto, eds., *Lexikon der Ägyptologie* (Wiesbaden, 1975–)
LexHebAram	F. Zorell, *Lexicon hebraicum et aramaicum Veteris Testamenti* (Rome, 1958, repr. 1968)

LexLingAeth A. Dillmann, *Lexicon linguae aethiopicae* (Leipzig, 1865)
LexLingAram E. Vogt, *Lexicon linguae aramaicae Veteris Testamenti documentis antiquis illustratum* (Rome, 1971)
LexSyr C. Brockelmann, *Lexicon syriacum* (Halle, 1928, ^{2}1968)
Lisowsky G. Lisowsky, *Konkordanz zum hebräischen AT* (Stuttgart, 1958, ^{2}1966)
lit. literally
LOT Z. Ben Ḥayyim, *The Literary and Oral Tradition of Hebrew and Aramaic Amongst the Samaritans* (Jerusalem, 1957)
LSJ H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, and H. S. Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford, ^{9}1940)
LThK *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, ed. M. Buchberger, 10 vols. (Freiburg, 1930-38); ed. J. Höfer and K. Rahner, 10 vols. and 3 sups. (^{2}1957-68, ^{3}1966-68)
LUÅ *Lunds Universitets Årsskrift*
LXX Septuagint (LXX^{A}, Codex Alexandrinus; LXX^{B}, Codex Vaticanus; LXX^{Or}, Origen; LXX^{R}, Lucianic recension; $LXX^{S[1,2]}$, Codex Sinaiticus, correctors 1, 2, etc.)
M Masada (manuscript)
Mand. Mandaic
Mandelkern S. Mandelkern, *Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae* (Tel Aviv, 1971)
MAOG *Mitteilungen der Altorientalischen Gesellschaft*, Leipzig
masc. masculine
MdD E. S. Drower and R. Macuch, *Mandaic Dictionary* (Oxford, 1963)
MEE *Materiali Epigrafici di Ebla*, Naples
Mek. Mekilta; Y., of Rabbi Simeon ben Yoḥai
Meyer R. Meyer, *Hebräische Grammatik*, 4 vols. (Berlin, ^{3}1966-72)
mg. margin
MGWJ *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums*, Breslau
Michel D. Michel, *Grundlegung einer hebräischen Syntax*, I (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1977)
Midr. Midrash
MIO *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung*, Berlin
Mish. Mishnah
Moab. Moabite
MRS *Mission de Ras Shamra*, Paris
ms(s). manuscript(s)
MSL *Materialen zum sumerischen Lexikon*, Rome
MT Masoretic Text
MTS *Münchener theologische Studien*, Munich
Mur Wadi Murabba'at text(s)
Mus *Muséon*, Louvain
MUSJ *Mélanges de l'Université St.-Joseph*, Beirut
MüSt *Münsterschwarzacher Studien*
MVÄG *Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Ägyptischen Gesellschaft*, Berlin, Leipzig
n(n). note(s)
N,Ntn passive, reflexive stem
Nab. Nabatean
NBSS T. Nöldeke, *Neue Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft* (Strassburg, 1910)
NCBC *New Century Bible Commentary*, Grand Rapids and London
NEB *Die Neue Echter-Bibel*, Würzburg
NedTT *Nederlands theologisch Tijdschrift*, Wageningen

NERT	*Near Eastern Religious Texts Relating to the OT,* ed. W. Beyerlin. *OTL* (Eng. trans. 1978)
NGTT	*Nederduitse gereformeerde teologiese tydskrif,* Capetown
NICOT	*New International Commentary on the OT,* Grand Rapids
NKZ	*Neue kirkliche Zeitschrift,* Erlangen, Leipzig
no(s).	number(s)
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version (New York, 1989)
NRT	*Nouvelle revue théologique,* Louvain, Paris
N.S.	new series
NSS	J. Barth, *Die Nominalbildung in den semitischen Sprachen* (^{2}1894, repr. Hildesheim, 1967)
NT	New Testament, Neues Testament, etc.
NTS	*New Testament Studies,* Cambridge
NTT	*Norsk teologisk Tidsskrift,* Oslo
obj.	object
OBO	*Orbis biblicus et orientalis,* Fribourg, Göttingen
OBT	*Overtures to Biblical Theology,* Philadelphia, Minneapolis
obv.	obverse of a papyrus or tablet
OL	Old Latin (OL^S, Fragmenta Sangallensia Prophetarum)
OLP	*Orientalia lovaniensa periodica,* Louvain
OLZ	*Orientalistische Literaturzeitung,* Leipzig, Berlin
Or	*Orientalia,* Rome
OrAnt	Oriens antiquus, Rome
OrS	*Orientalia Suecana,* Uppsala
OSA	Old South Arabic
OT	Old Testament, Oude Testament, etc.
OTL	*Old Testament Library,* Philadelphia, Louisville
OTS	*Oudtestamentische Studiën,* Leiden
OTWSA	*Ou testamentiese werkgemeenskap in Suid-Afrika,* Pretoria
p(p).	page(s)
P	Priestly source (P^G, Priestly *Grundschrift* ["basic material"]; P^S, secondary Priestly source)
Palmyr.	Palmyrene
Pap.	Papyrus
par.	parallel/and parallel passages
pass.	passive
PEQ	*Palestine Exploration Quarterly,* London
PEFQS	*Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement,* London
perf.	perfect
Pes.	Pesiqta
Phil.-hist. Kl.	Philosophische-historische Klasse
Phoen.	Phoenician
PJ	*Palästinajahrbuch,* Berlin
pl(s).	plate(s)
pl.	plural
PLO	*Porta linguarum orientalium,* Wiesbaden
PN	personal name
PNPI	J. K. Stark, *Personal Names in Palmyrene Inscriptions* (Oxford, 1971)
PNU	F. Grondähl, *Die Personennamen der Texte aus Ugarit. StPohl* 1 (1967)
POS	*Pretoria Oriental Series,* Leiden
POT	*De Prediking van het OT,* Nijkerk
prep(s).	preposition(s)
PRU	*Le Palais royal d'Ugarit,* ed. C. F.-A. Schaeffer and J. Nougayrol. *MRS*

ptcp. participle
PTMS *Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series*
Pun. Punic
PW A. Pauly and G. Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft,* 6 vols. (Stuttgart, 1839-52); Sup, 11 vols. (1903-56); ser. 2, 10 vols. (1914-48)
Pyr. 23,36 K. Sethe, *Die altägyptischen Pyramidentexte,* 4 vols. (Leipzig, 1908-22)
Q Qumran scroll (preceded by arabic numeral designating cave)
Q *Qere*
QD *Quaestiones disputatae,* Florence
r. reverse (side of a tablet, coin, etc.)
R Redactor (R^D, Deuteronomistic; R^P, Priestly; R^J, Yahwist)
RA *Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale,* Paris
Rab. Rabbah (midrashic commentary)
RAC *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum,* ed. T. Klauser (Stuttgart, 1950–)
Rahlfs A. Rahlfs, ed., *Septuaginta* (Stuttgart, 1935)
RAI *Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale,* Paris
RÄR H. Bonnet, *Reallexikon der ägyptischen Religionsgeschichte* (Berlin, 1952, ^{2}1971)
RB *Revue biblique,* Paris
RE *Real-Enzyclopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche,* ed. A. Hauck, 24 vols. (Leipzig, ^{3}1896-1913)
REJ *Revue des études juives,* Paris
repr. reprint, reprinted
RES *Répertoire d'épigraphie sémitique* (Paris, 1900–) (with number of text)
rev. revised, revision
RevBibl *Revista bíblica,* Buenos Aires
RevQ *Revue de Qumrân,* Paris
RGG *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (Tübingen, ^{2}1927-31, ed. H. Gunkel and L. Zscharnack, 5 vols.; ^{3}1957-65, ed. K. Galling, 6 vols.)
RHPR *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses,* Strasbourg, Paris
RHR *Revue de l'histoire des religions,* Paris
RivB *Rivista biblica,* Rome
RLA *Reallexikon der Assyriologie,* ed. E. Ebeling and B. Meissner (Berlin, 1932–)
RM *Die Religion der Menschheit,* Stuttgart
RMA R. C. Thompson, *Reports of the Magicians and Astrologers* (London, 1900ff.)
RS Ras Shamra text
RSO *Rivista degli studi orientali,* Rome
RSP *Ras Shamra Parallels: The Texts from Ugarit and the Hebrew Bible,* ed. L. R. Fisher et al., I, *AnOr* 49 (1972); II, *AnOr* 50 (1975); III, *AnOr* 51 (1981)
RSPT *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques,* Paris
RSR *Recherches de science religieuse,* Paris
RSV Revised Standard Version (New York, 1946, 1952)
RTP *Revue de théologie et de philosophie,* Lausanne
RVV *Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten*
Sab. Sabaic
Saf. Safaitic
SAHG A. Falkenstein and W. von Soden, *Sumerische und akkadische Hymnen und Gebeten* (Zurich, 1953)
Sam. Samaritan
SANT *Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament,* Munich

SAT	*Die Schriften des ATs in Auswahl,* ed. H. Gunkel and H. Gressmann, 7 vols. (Göttingen, [2]1920-22)
SB	*Sources bibliques,* Paris
SBB	*Stuttgarter biblische Beiträge*
SBFLA	*Studii biblici franciscani liber annus,* Jerusalem
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SBLDS	*SBL Dissertation Series,* Missoula, Chico, Atlanta
SBLMS	*SBL Monograph Series,* Missoula, Chico, Atlanta
SBLSBS	*SBL Sources for Biblical Study,* Chico, Atlanta
SBLSCS	*SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies,* Missoula, Chico, Atlanta
SBM	*Stuttgarter biblische Monographien*
SBS	*Stuttgarter Bibel-Studien*
SBT	*Studies in Biblical Theology,* London, Naperville
ScrHier	*Scripta hierosolymitana,* Jerusalem
SEÅ	*Svensk exegetisk Åarsbok,* Lund
Sem.	Semitic
Sem	*Semitica,* Paris
Seux	J. M. Seux, *Epithètes royales akkadiennes et sumériennes* (Paris, 1967)
SFS	*Studia Francisci Scholten memoriae dedicatae*
sg.	singular
SGV	*Sammlung gemeinverständlicher Vorträge und Schriften,* Tübingen
SJLA	*Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity,* Leiden
SJT	*Scottish Journal of Theology,* Edinburgh
SNTSMS	*Society for NT Studies Monograph Series,* Cambridge
SNVAO	*Skrifter utgitt av det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo*
SR	*Studies in Religion/Sciences religieuses,* Toronto
SSAW	*Sitzungsberichte der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig,* Phil.-hist. Kl.
SSN	*Studia semitica neerlandica,* Assen
ST	*Studia theologica,* Lund, Århus, Riga
St.-B.	H. L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum NT aus Talmud und Midrasch,* 6 vols. (Munich, 1922-61)
STDJ	*Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah,* Leiden, Grand Rapids
StOr	*Studia orientalia,* Helsinki
StPh	*Studia Phoenicia*
StPB	*Studia Post-Biblica* (Rome)
StPohl	*Studia Pohl,* Rome
sub ast.	under the asterisk
subj.	subject
subst.	substantive
suf.	suffix
Sum.	Sumerian
SUNT	*Studien zur Umwelt des NTs,* Göttingen
Sup	Supplement(s) (to)
s.v.	*sub voce (vocibus),* under the word(s)
SVT	*Supplements to VT,* Leiden
SWBA	*Social World of Biblical Antiquity,* Sheffield
SWJT	*Southwestern Journal of Theology,* Seminary Hill, Texas
Synt	C. Brockelmann, *Hebräische Syntax* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1956)
Syr.	Syriac
Syr	*Syria. Revue d'art oriental et d'archéologie,* Paris
T	Testament
TAVO	*Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients,* Wiesbaden

TDNT	*Theological Dictionary of the NT,* ed. G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, 9 vols. plus index vol. (Eng. trans., Grand Rapids, 1964-76)
TDOT	*Theological Dictionary of the OT,* ed. G. J. Botterweck, H. Ringgren, and H.-J. Fabry (Eng. trans., Grand Rapids, 1974–)
Tg.	Targum; Frag. Tg., Fragmentary Targum; Tg. Jon., Targum Jonathan from Codex Reuchlinianus; Tg. Neof., Targum Neofiti; Tg. Onq., Targum Onqelos; Tg. Ps.-J., Targum Pseudo-Jonathan
TGI	K. Galling, *Textbuch zur Geschichte Israels* (Tübingen, 1950, ^{2}1968, ^{3}1979)
Tham.	Thamudic
ThArb	*Theologische Arbeiten,* Berlin
ThB	*Theologische Bücherei,* Munich
ThS	*Theologische Studien,* Zurich
ThV	*Theologische Versuche,* Berlin
Tigr.	Tigriña
TLOT	*Theological Lexicon of the OT,* ed. E. Jenni and C. Westermann, 3 vols. (Eng. trans., Peabody, Mass., 1997)
TLZ	*Theologische Literaturzeitung,* Leipzig, Berlin
TM	Tell Mardikh-Ebla tablets
TO	A. Caquot, M. Sznycer, and A. Herdner, *Textes ougaritiques. I. Mythes et légendes. LAPO,* 2 vols. (Paris, 1974-89)
TOB	Traduction oecuménique de la Bible (Paris, 1983)
Tos.	Tosephta
TOTC	*Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries,* London, Downers Grove
TP	*Theologie und Philosophie*
TQ	*Theologische Quartalschrift,* Tübingen, Stuttgart
trans.	translation, translated by
TRE	*Theologische Realenzyklopädie,* ed. G. Krause, G. Müller, and H. R. Balz, 22 vols. (Berlin, 1977-92)
TRu	*Theologische Rundschau,* Tübingen
TSK	*Theologische Studien und Kritiken,* Hamburg, Gotha, Leipzig
TSSI	J. C. L. Gibson, *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions,* 3 vols. (Oxford, 1975-82)
TTK	*Tidsskrift for teologi og kirke,* Oslo
TTS	*Trierer theologische Studien*
TUAT	*Texte aus der Umwelt des ATs,* Gütersloh
TWNT	*Theologisches Wörterbuch zum NT,* ed. G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, 10 vols. plus index (Stuttgart, 1933-79)
TynB	*Tyndale Bulletin,* London
TZ	*Theologische Zeitschrift,* Basel
UF	*Ugarit-Forschungen,* Neukirchen-Vluyn
Ugar.	Ugaritic
Univ.	University
Urk.	*Urkunden des ägyptischen Altertums,* ed. G. Steindorff (Leipzig, Berlin, 1903–)
UT	C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook. AnOr* 38 (1965, ^{2}1967)
UUÅ	*Uppsala universitets årsskrift*
v(v).	verse(s)
VAB	*Vorderasiatische Bibliothek,* 7 vols. (Leipzig, 1907-16)
vb.	verb
VD	*Verbum domini,* Rome
VG	C. Brockelmann, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen,* 2 vols. (1908-13, repr. Hildesheim, 1961)
VT	*Vetus Testamentum,* Leiden

Vulg.	Vulgate
Wagner	M. Wagner, *Die lexikalischen und grammatikalischen Aramaismen im alttestamentlichen Hebräisch. BZAW* 96 (1966)
WbÄS	A. Erman and H. Grapow, *Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache,* 6 vols. (Leipzig, 1926-31, repr. 1963)
WBC	*Word Biblical Commentary,* Waco, Dallas, Nashville
WbMyth	*Wörterbuch der Mythologie,* ed. H. W. Haussig (Stuttgart, 1965–)
WbTigr	E. Littmann and M. Höfner, *Wörterbuch der Tigre Sprache* (Wiesbaden, 1962)
WdF	*Wege der Forschung*
Wehr	H. Wehr, *A Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic,* ed. J. M. Cowan (Ithaca, 1961, ^{3}1971, ^{4}1979)
Whitaker	R. E. Whitaker, *A Concordance of the Ugaritic Language* (Cambridge, Mass., 1972)
WMANT	*Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament,* Neukirchen-Vluyn
WO	*Die Welt des Orients,* Göttingen
WTJ	*Westminster Theological Journal,* Philadelphia
WTM	J. Levy, *Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim,* 4 vols. (Leipzig, ^{2}1924, repr. 1963)
WuD	*Wort und Dienst,* Bielefeld
WUNT	*Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum NT,* Tübingen
WUS	J. Aistleitner, *Wörterbuch der ugaritischen Sprache. BSAW,* Phil.-hist. Kl. 106/3 (1963, ^{4}1974)
ZA	*Zeitschrift für Assyriologie,* Leipzig, Berlin
ZÄS	*Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde,* Leipzig, Berlin
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft,* Giessen, Berlin
ZBK	*Zürcher Bibelkommentare,* Zurich, Stuttgart
ZDMG	*Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft,* Leipzig, Wiesbaden
ZDPV	*Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins,* Leipzig, Stuttgart, Wiesbaden
Ziegler	J. Ziegler, ed., *Septuaginta* (Göttingen, 1931–)
ZKT	*Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*
ZNW	*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft,* Giessen, Berlin
ZRGG	*Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte*
ZTK	*Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche,* Tübingen
ZZ	*Die Zeichen der Zeit*

→	cross-reference within this Dictionary
<	derived from
>	whence derived to
*	theoretical form

TRANSLITERATION

VOWELS

Vowel	Transliteration
ַ	a
ֲ	^{a}
ָ	ā
ָה	â
ָיו	āyw
ַי	ay
ָי	āy
ֶ	e
ֱ	^{e}
ֶי	ey
ֵ	ē
ֵי	ê
ְ	^{e}
ִ	i
ִי	î
ִיּ	îy
ָ	o
ֳ	^{o}
ֹ	ō
וֹ	ô
ֻ	u, ū
וּ	û

CONSONANTS

Consonant	Transliteration
א	ʾ
בּ	b
ב	ḇ
גּ	g
ג	g̱
דּ	d
ד	ḏ
ה, הּ	h
ו	w
ז	z
ח	ḥ
ט	ṭ
י	y
ךּ, כּ	k
ך, כ	ḵ
ל	l
ם, מ	m
ן, נ	n
ס	s
ע	ʿ
פּ	p
ף, פ	p̄
ץ, צ	ṣ
ק	q
ר	r
שׂ	ś
שׁ	š
תּ	t
ת	ṯ

פָּסַח *pāsaḥ;* פֶּסַח *pesaḥ*

Contents: I. Meanings: 1. *psḥ* and Related Semitic Terms; 2. *pesaḥ;* 3. Translations. II. History of *pesaḥ:* 1. Family Ritual; 2. Dtn Reform Program; 3. Development of Priestly *pesaḥ* Programs in the Pentateuch and in the "Draft Constitution" of Ezekiel; 4. Development of the Late Israelite *pesaḥ* in the Mazzot Papyrus of Elephantine and in the Christian *pesaḥ* Traditions; 5. Late Israelite and Early Jewish *pesaḥ* in Mishnah and Targum; 6. *pesaḥ* in Jubilees, the Qumran Festival Calendar, and the Temple Scroll.

---

pāsaḥ. D. C. Arichea, "Translating Biblical Festivals," *BT* 32 (1981) 413-23; W. R. Arnold, "The Passover Papyrus from Elephantine," *JBL* 31 (1912) 1-33; C. W. Atkinson, "The Ordinances of Passover-Unleavened Bread," *ATR* 44 (1962) 70-85; E. Auerbach, "Die Feste im alten Israel," *VT* 8 (1958) 1-18; G. Auzou, *De la servitude au service* (Paris, 1961); T. Barrosse, "Pascha und Paschamahl," *Conc* 4 (1968) 728-33; G. Beer, *Pascha oder das jüdische Osterfest. SGV* 64 (1911); idem, "Miscellen. 2. Die Bitterkräuter beim Paschafest," *ZAW* 31 (1911) 152-53; idem, *Pesachim (Ostern). Text, Übersetzung und Erklärung. Die Mischna II/3* (1912); S. Ben-Chorin, *Narrative Theologie des Judentums anhand der Pessach-Haggada. Jerusalemer Vorlesungen* (Tübingen, 1985); J. Benzinger, *Hebräische Archäologie* ([3]1927); J. Blau, "Über homonyme und angeblich homonyme Wurzeln," *VT* 6 (1956) 242-48; *VT* 7 (1957) 98-102; J. Bowman, "The Importance of the Moon in Hebrew and Samaritan Festival Observances," *Actes du Congrès International des Orientalistes* 25/I (1962) 360-62; W. Brandt, "Zur Bestreichung mit Blut," *ZAW* 33 (1913) 80-81; G. Braulik, "Leidensgedächtnisfeier und Freudenfest. 'Volksliturgie' nach dem deuteronomischen Festkalendar (Dtn 16,1-17)," *TP* 56 (1981) 335-57; idem, "Pascha — von der alttestamentlichen Feier zum neutestamentlichen Fest," *BiKi* 36 (1981) 159-65; S. P. Brock, "An Early Interpretation of *pāsaḥ: 'aggēn* in the Palestinian Targum," *FS E. I. J. Rosenthal* (Cambridge, 1982), 27-34; A. Brock-Utne, "Eine religionsgeschichtliche Studie zu dem ursprünglichen Passahopfer," *ARW* 31 (1934) 272-78; G. B. Bruzzone, *I mesi della Bibbia: Nisan. BietOr* 27 (1985) 223-27; idem, "Isaac and the Second Night," *Bibl* 61 (1980) 78-88; R. Cantalamessa, *La Pasqua della nostra salvezza. Le tradizioni pasquali della Bibbia et de la primitiva chiesa* (Turin, 1971); J. Carmignac, "Comment Jésus et ses contemporains pouvaient-ils célébrer la Pâque à une date non officielle," *RevQ* 5 (1964/65) 59-79; F. Chenderlin, "Distributed Observance of the Passover — a Hypothesis," *Bibl* 56 (1975) 369-93; A. Cholewiński, *Heiligkeitsgesetz und Deuteronomium. AnBibl* 66 (1976); B. Couroyer, "L'origine égyptienne du mot 'Pâque,'" *RB* 62 (1955) 481-96; J. Creten, "La Pâque des Samaritains," *RB* 31 (1922) 434-42; G. Dalman, "Das samaritanische Passah im Verhältnis zum jüdischen," *PJ* 8 (1912) 121-38; idem, *AuS,* I; R. J. Daly, "The Soteriological Significance of the Sacrifice of Isaac," *CBQ* 39 (1977) 45-75; P. R. Davies, "Passover and the Dating of the Aqedah," *JJS* 30 (1979) 59-67; idem, "The Sacrifice of Isaac and Passover," *Studia Biblica, I: Papers on OT Linguistics (1978). JSOTSup* 11 (1979), 127-32; idem and B. D. Chilton, "The Aqedah: A Revised Tradition-History," *CBQ* 40 (1978) 514-46; R. Le Déaut, *La Nuit Pascale: Essai sur la signification de la Pâque Juive à partir du Targum d'Exode XII.42. AnBibl* 22 (1963); M. Delcor, "Réflexions sur la Pâque du temps de Josias d'après 2 Rois 23,21-23," *Henoch* 4 (1982) 205-19; B.-J. Diebner, "'Passa' als interpretatio iudaica des Kreuzestodes Jesu," *DBAT* 18 (1984) 85-94; idem, "Gottesdienst II. AT," *TRE,* XIV (1985), 5-28; A. Dupont-Sommer, "Sur la fête de la Pâque dans les documents araméens d'Éléphantine," *REJ* 107 (1946/47) 39-51; J. H. Eaton, "Dancing in the OT," *ExpT* 86 (1974/75) 136-40; B. D. Eerdmans, "Das Mazzoth-Fest," *FS T. Nöldeke* (1906), II, 671-79; idem, "Passover and the Days of the Unleav-

I. Meanings.

1. *psḥ and Related Semitic Terms.* The verb *psḥ* occurs in Ex. 12:13,23,27; 1 K. 18:21; Isa. 31:5; 2 S. 4:4 (niphal); 1 K. 18:26 (piel). The verbal adj. *pissēaḥ* is a deriv-

---

ened Bread," *Expositor* 8 (1909) 448-62; E. L. Ehrlich, *Die Kultsymbolik im AT und im nachbiblischen Judentum. Symbolik der Religionen* 3 (1959); O. Eissfeldt, "Feste und Feiern. II. In Israel," *RGG*[3], II (1958), 550-58; I. Elbogen, *Der jüdische Gottesdienst in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung* ([3]1931; repr. Hildesheim, [4]1967); H. J. Elhorst, "Die deuteronomischen Jahresfeste," *ZAW* 42 (1924) 136-45; I. Engnell, "Paesaḥ-Maṣṣōt a Hebrew Annual Festival of the Ancient Near Eastern Pattern," *Proceedings of the 7th Congress for the History of Religions 1950* (Amsterdam, 1951), 111-13; idem, "Paesaḥ-Maṣṣōt and the Problem of 'Patternism,'" *OrS* 1 (1952) 39-50; H. Ewald, "De feriarum hebraeorum origine ac ratione commentatio," *Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 3 (1840) 410-41; idem, *Die Alterthümer des Volkes Israel. Anhang zu Bd. II/III der Geschichte des Volkes Israel* ([3]1866); F. Festorazzi, "La celebrazione della Pasqua ebraica (Es 12)," *Parola — Spirito e Vita* 7 (1983) 9-22; G. Fohrer, *Überlieferung und Geschichte des Exodus. BZAW* 91 (1964); M. Fraenkel, "Der Name des Pessachfestes," *HaKidmah* 14 (1961) 647; T. Friedman, *"dm krbn psḥ," BethM* 28 (1982/83) 23-28; N. Füglister, *Die Heilsbedeutung des Pascha. SANT* 8 (1963); T. H. Gaster, *Festivals of the Jewish Year* (New York, 1953); idem, *Passover, Its History and Tradition* (London/New York, 1958); A. George, "De l'agneau pascal à l'agneau de Dieu," *BVC* 9 (1955) 85-90; G. Gerleman, "Was heisst פָּסַח?" *ZAW* 88 (1976) 409-13; T. F. Glasson, "The 'Passover,' a Misnomer: The Meaning of the Verb *pāsach*," *JTS* 10 (1959) 79-84; N. N. Glatzer, *The Passover Haggadah* (New York, 1953); R. Goetschel, "Le Midrash de la seconde Pâque," *Exégèse biblique et Judaïsme*, ed. J. E. Ménard (Leiden, 1973), 8-14; G. B. Gray, "Passover and Unleavened Bread: The Laws of J, E and D," *JTS* 37 (1936) 241-53; P. Grelot, "Études sur le 'Papyrus Pascal' d'Éléphantine," *VT* 4 (1954) 349-84; idem, "Le 'Papyrus Pascal' d'Éléphantine et le problème du Pentateuque," *VT* 5 (1955) 250-65; idem, "La dernière étape de la rédaction sacerdotale," *VT* 6 (1956) 174-89; idem, "Le Papyrus Pascal d'Éléphantine: Nouvel Examen," *VT* 17 (1967) 114-17; idem, "Le Papyrus Pascal d'Éléphantine: Essai de restauration," *VT* 17 (1967) 201-7; idem, "Le Papyrus Pascal d'Éléphantine et les lettres d'Hermopolis," *VT* 17 (1967) 481-83; idem and J. Pierron, *The Paschal Feast in the Bible* (Eng. trans. 1966); M. J. Gruber, "Ten Dance-Derived Expressions in the Hebrew Bible," *Bibl* 62 (1981) 328-46; H. Guthe, *Das Passahfest nach Dtn 16. BZAW* 33 (1918), 217-32; idem, "Zum Passah der jüdischen Religionsgemeinde," *TSK* 96/97 (1925) 144-71; H. Haag, *Ursprung und Sinn der alttestamentlichen Paschafeier: Das Opfer der Kirche. Luzerner theologische Studien* 1 (1954), 17-46; idem, "Pâque," *DBS* VI, 1120-49; idem, "Das Pascha als alttestamentliche Bundesfeier," *BiKi* 15 (1960) 34-36; idem, *Vom alten zum neuen Pascha: Geschichte und Theologie des Osterfestes. SBS* 49 (1971); idem, "Das liturgische Leben der Qumrangemeinde," *Das Buch des Bundes* (Düsseldorf, 1980), 119-49; idem, "Das christliche Pascha," ibid., 201-15; idem, "Das Mazzenfest des Hiskia," ibid., 216-25; F. Hahn, "Alttestamentliche Motive in der urchristlichen Abendmahlsüberlieferung," *EvT* 27 (1967) 337-74; J. Halbe, "Passa-Massot im deuteronomischen Festkalender," *ZAW* 87 (1975) 147-68; idem, "Erwägungen zu Ursprung und Wesen des Massotfestes," *ZAW* 87 (1975) 324-46; M. Haran, "The Passover Sacrifice," *Studies in the Religion of Ancient Israel. SVT* 23 (1972) 86-116; idem, *Temples and Temple-Service in Ancient Israel* (Oxford, 1978); A. Heitzmann, "El Cantar de los Cantares: Poesia y ritual de la Pascua," *EstBíb* 43 (1985) 321-30; J. Henninger, "Les fêtes de printemps chez les Arabes et leurs implications historiques," *Revista do Museu Paulista* 4 (1950) 389-432; idem, "Über Frühlingsfeste bei den Semiten," *In Verbo Tuo. FS Missionspriesterseminar St. Augustin bei Siegburg* (1963), 375-98; idem, *Les fêtes de printemps chez les Sémites et la pâque israélite. ÉBib* (1975); idem, "'Pāsaḥ' und Wiederauferstehungsglaube," *ZRGG* 35 (1983) 161-62; H. W. Hertzberg, "Zum samaritanischen Passah," *FS D. H. Rendtorff* (1958), 130-36; H. H. Hirschberg, "Die Grund-

ative (Lev. 21:18; Dt. 15:21; 2 S. 5:6,8; 9:13; 19:27[Eng. 26]; Job 29:15; Prov. 26:7; Isa. 33:23; 35:6; Jer. 31:8; Mal. 1:8,13). Attempts to understand the semantic spec-

---

bedeutung des Passahfestes," *ZRGG* 26 (1974) 355-56; J. Hofbauer, "Die Pascha-Maṣṣōt- und Erstgeburtsgesetze des Auszugsberichtes Ex 12 und 13," *ZKT* 60 (1936) 188-210; S. H. Hooke, *The Origin of Early Semitic Ritual* (London, 1938); F. Horst, *Das Privilegrecht Jahwes. FRLANT* 45 (1930) = *Gottes Recht. ThB* 12 (1961) 17-154; F.-L. Hossfeld, "Der Durchgang vom Leiden zum Leben: Alttestamentliche Themen der Osternacht," *Lebendige Seelsorge* 34 (1983) 1-6; W. Huber, *Passa und Ostern. BZNW* 35 (1969); A. Jaussen, *Coutumes des Arabes au pays de Moab* (Paris, 1908); A. Jeremias, *The OT in the Light of the Ancient East,* 2 vols. (Eng. trans. 1910); J. Jeremias, *Die Passahfeier der Samaritaner und ihre Bedeutung für das Verständnis der alttestamentlichen Passahüberlieferung. BZAW* 59 (1932); idem, "πάσχα," *TDNT,* V, 896-904; idem, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (Eng. trans. 1966); M. Joseph, "Passover (Pesach)," *Universal Jewish Encyclopedia,* VIII (New York, 1942), 408-10; O. Keel, "Erwägungen zum Sitz im Leben des vormosaischen Pascha und zur Etymologie von פֶּסַח," *ZAW* 84 (1972) 414-34; F. Kohata, *Jahwist und Priesterschrift in Exodus 3–14. BZAW* 166 (1986); E. König, *Geschichte der alttestamentlichen Religion* ([2]1915); K. Kohler, "Blutbestreichung und die Phylakterien," *ARW* 13 (1910) 81-84; idem, "Verbot des Knochenzerbrechens," *ARW* 13 (1910) 153-54; H.-J. Kraus, "Zur Geschichte des Passah-Massot-Festes im AT," *EvT* 18 (1958) 47-67; idem, *Worship in Israel* (Eng. trans. 1966); A. Kuenen, *The Religion of Israel to the Fall of the Jewish State,* 3 vols. (Eng. trans. 1882-83); G. Kunhert, "Das Gilgalpassah" (diss., Mainz, 1982); E. Kutsch, "Erwägungen zur Geschichte der Passahfeier und des Maṣṣotfestes," *ZTK* 55 (1958) 1-35; idem, "Feste und Feiern II. In Israel," *RGG*[3] II (1958) 910-17; P. Laaf, *Die Pascha-Feier Israels. BBB* 36 (1970); S. Linder, "Die Passahfeier der Samaritaner auf dem Berge Garizim," *PJ* 8 (1912) 104-20; F. Lindström, *God and the Origin of Evil. CBOT* 21 (1983); G. Lüling, "Das Passahlamm und die altarabische 'Mutter der Blutrache,' die Hyäne," *ZRGG* 34 (1982) 130-47; T. Maertens, *C'est fête en l'honneur de Jahvé* (Brugge, 1961); R. Martin-Achard, *Essai biblique sur les fêtes d'Israël* (Geneva, 1974); H. G. May, "The Relation of the Passover to the Festival of Unleavened Cakes," *JBL* 55 (1936) 65-82; G. Mayer, "Passa und Hohes Lied," *Friede über Israel* 59 (1976) 2-7; J. G. McConville, *Law and Theology in Deuteronomy. JSOTSup* 33 (1984); J. W. McKay, "The Date of Passover and Its Significance," *ZAW* 84 (1972) 435-47; C. Mohrmann, "Pascha, passio, transitus," *Études sur le latin des chrétiens,* I (Rome, 1958), 205-22; J. Morgenstern, "The Bones of the Paschal Lamb," *JAOS* 36 (1916) 146-53; L. Morris, "The Passover in Rabbinic Literature," *ABR* 4 (1954/55) 57-76; S. Mowinckel, "Die vermeintliche 'Passahlegende': Ex 1–15 in bezug auf die Frage Literaturkritik und Traditionskritik," *ST* 5 (1951) 66-88; J. Müller, *Kritischer Versuch über den Ursprung und die geschichtliche Entwicklung des Pesach- und Mazzothfestes* (Bonn, 1883); J. Neusner, *A History of the Mishnaic Law of Appointed Times,* part 2: *Erubin, Pesahim. SJLA* 34/2 (Leiden, 1981); N. W. Nicolsky, "Pascha im Kulte des jerusalemischen Tempels," *ZAW* 45 (1927) 171-90, 241-53; S. I. L. Norin, *Er spaltete das Meer: Die Auszugsüberlieferung in Psalmen und Kult des alten Israel. CBOT* 9 (1977); W. O. E. Oesterley, "Early Hebrew Festival Rituals," in S. H. Hooke, ed., *Myth and Ritual* (Oxford/London, 1933), 111-46; M. Ohana, "Agneau pascal et circoncision: Le problème de la Halakha prémishnaïque dans le Targum palestinien," *VT* 23 (1973) 385-99; E. Olávarri, "La celebración de la Pascua y los Acimos en la legislación del AT," *EstBíb* 30 (1971) 231-68; 31 (1972) 17-41, 293-320; H. Oort, "Oud-Israëls Paaschfeest," *Theologisch Tijdschrift* 42 (1908) 483-506; E. Otto, *Das Mazzotfest in Gilgal. BWANT* 107 (1975); idem, "Erwägungen zum überlieferungsgeschichtlichen Ursprung und 'Sitz im Leben' des jahwistischen Plagenzyklus," *VT* 26 (1976) 3-27; idem, "Feste und Feiertage II. AT," *TRE,* XI (1983), 96-106; idem, "Zur Semantik von hebr. *psḥ/pisseaḥ* und akk. *pessû(m)/pessātu(m),*" *BN* 41 (1988) 31-35; idem and T. Schramm, *Festival and Joy* (Eng. trans. 1980); J. Pedersen, "Passahfest und Passahlegende," *ZAW* 52 (1934) 161-75; J. J. Petuchowski, "Wirkliche und vermeintliche messianische Elemente

trum of *psḥ* by assuming the presence of two different homonymous roots (Ex. 12:13,23,27; Isa. 31:5: "pass by," "spare"/2 S. 4:4; 1 K. 18:21,26: "walk with a limp,"

---

der Sederfeier," *Jud* 40 (1985) 37-44; J. van der Ploeg, "The Meals of the Essenes," *JSS* 2 (1957) 163-75; J. Potin, "Les sacrifices de sang dans l'AT," *Bible et Terre Sainte* 74 (1965) 6-7; K. von Rabenau, "Passa," *Evangelisches Kirchenlexikon* III ([2]1962) 72-75; G. M. Redslob, "Die biblischen Angaben über Stiftung und Grund der Paschafeier vom allegorisch-kabbalistischen Standpunkte aus betrachtet," *Verzeichnis der Vorlesungen, welche am Hamburgischen Akademischen und Real-Gymnasium von Ostern 1856 bis Ostern 1857 gehalten werden* (Hamburg, 1856), 1-63; W. Riedel, "Miscellen. 5. פָּסַח," *ZAW* 20 (1900) 319-29; H. Ringgren, *Israelite Religion* (Eng. trans. 1966); J. Rosenthal, "Passover and the Festival of Unleavened Bread," *JJS* 3 (1952) 178-80; S. Ros-Garmendia, *La Pascua en el AT. Biblica Victoriensia* 3 (Vitoria, 1978); L. Rost, "Weidewechsel und altisraelitischer Festkalender," *ZDPV* 66 (1943) 205-15 = *Das kleine Credo und andere Studien zum AT* (Heidelberg, 1965), 101-12; idem, "Josias Passa," *Studien zum AT. BWANT* 101 (1974), 87-93; H. H. Rowley, *Worship in Ancient Israel* (London, 1967); J. C. Rylaarsdam, "Passover and Feast of Unleavened Bread," *IDB*, III, 663-68; S. Safrai, *Die Wallfahrt im Zeitalter des Zweiten Tempels. Forschungen zum jüdisch-christlichen Dialog* 3 (1981); G. Sauer, "Israels Feste und ihr Verhältnis zum Jahweglauben," *Studien zum Pentateuch. FS W. Kornfeld* (Vienna, 1977), 135-41; G. Sauter, "Passahaggada und Osterpredigt," *AT und christliche Verkündigung. FS A. A. J. Gunneweg* (Stuttgart, 1987), 208-23; R. Schaefer, *Das Passah-Mazzoth-Fest nach seinen Ursprüngen, seiner Bedeutung und seiner innerpentateuchischen Entwicklung im Zusammenhange mit der israelitischen Kultusgeschichte* (1900); J. Scharbert, "Das Pascha als Fest der Erlösung im AT," *Freude am Gottesdienst. FS J. G. Plöger* (Stuttgart, 1983), 21-30; A. Scheiber, "'Ihr sollt kein Bein dran zerbrechen,'" *VT* 13 (1963) 95-97; J. Schildenberger, "Der Gedächtnischarakter des alt- und neutestamentlichen Pascha," in B. Neunheuser, ed., *Opfer Christi und Opfer der Kirche* (Düsseldorf, 1960), 75-97; P. Schlesinger and J. Güns, *Die Pessach-Haggadah* (Tel Aviv, 1962); R. Schmitt, *Exodus und Passah: Ihr Zusammenhang im AT. OBO* 7 ([2]1982); J. Schreiner, "Ex 12,21-23 und das israelitische Pascha," *Studien zum Pentateuch. FS W. Kornfeld* (Vienna, 1977), 69-90; J. B. Segal, *The Hebrew Passover from the Earliest Times to A.D. 70.* London Oriental Series 12 (London, 1963); J. Van Seters, "The Place of the Yahwist in the History of Passover and Massot," *ZAW* 95 (1983) 167-82; L. Sirard, "Sacrifices et rites sanglants dans l'AT," *Sciences ecclésiastiques* 15 (1963) 173-97; N. H. Snaith, *The Jewish New Year Festival* (London, 1947); J. A. Soggin, "Gilgal, Passah und Landnahme: Eine neue Untersuchung des kultischen Zusammenhangs der Kap. III-VI des Josuabuches," *Volume de Congrès, Genève 1965. SVT* 15 (1966), 263-77; C. Steuernagel, "Zum Passa-Maṣṣothfest," *ZAW* 31 (1911) 310; C. H. Toy, "The Meaning of *paesaḥ*," *JBL* 16 (1897) 178-84; R. de Vaux, *Studies in OT Sacrifice* (Eng. trans. 1964); idem, *AncIsr;* G. Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism. StPB* 4 (Leiden, 1961); D. Völter, *Passah und Mazzoth und ihr ägyptisches Urbild* (Leiden, 1912); idem, *Der Ursprung von Passah und Mazzoth neu untersucht* (Leiden, 1913); L. Wächter, "Der jüdische Festkalender: Geschichte und Gegenwart," *ZZ* 34 (1980) 259-67; B. N. Wambacq, "Les origines de las Pesaḥ israélite," *Bibl* 57 (1976) 206-24, 301-26; idem, "Le Maṣṣôt," *Bibl* 61 (1980) 31-54; idem, "Pesaḥ-Maṣṣôt," *Bibl* 62 (1981) 499-518; A. C. Welch, "On the Method of Celebrating Passover," *ZAW* 45 (1927) 24-29; J. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* (Eng. trans. 1885, repr. Cleveland, 1957); J. A. Wilcoxen, "The Israelite Passover: Some Problems," *BR* 8 (1963) 13-27; H. Wildberger, *Jahwes Eigentumsvolk. ATANT* 37 (1960); F. E. Wilms, *Freude vor Gott: Kult und Fest in Israel* (Regensburg, 1981); F. Zeilinger, "Das Passionsbrot Israels: Deutungsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum ungesäuerten Brot im AT" (diss., Graz, 1963); P. Zerafa, "Passover and Unleavened Bread," *Angelicum* 41 (1964) 235-50; I. Zolli, "La Pasqua nella litteratura antico- e neotestamentaria," *Il Nazareno: Studi di esegesi neotestamentaria alla luce dell'aramaico e del pensiero rabbinico* (Udine, 1938), 178-227.

"be lame")[1] are of less explanatory value than attempts to derive this scope from a single root.[2] The only legitimate basis for explaining the meaning of *psḥ* is those occurrences of the finite verb form not associated with the popular-etymological explanation of the Passover ritual. Hebrew lexicographers assume a diachronic semantic development from "be lame"/"walk with a limp" to "spring, jump, jump over"/ "spare"[3] or a synchronic simultaneity of these meanings.[4] Recently, however, scholars have attempted to explain the occurrences on the basis of a common root meaning of *psḥ.* A basic meaning of "hop, leap, jump"[5] is less persuasive because 2 S. 4:4 cannot be subsumed under this meaning, nor can the verbal adj. *pissēaḥ* be derived from it. The prep. *'al* in *way^epass^eḥû 'al-hammizbēaḥ* (1 K. 18:26) contradicts the interpretation as a cultic "hobble dance" around the altar[6] and results in the improbable thesis of "jumping over [the altar]."[7] In Isa. 31:5 *pāsōaḥ* parallels *gānôn*[8] and hardly refers to the hopping of a bird.[9]

The various occurrences can be better subsumed under the meaning "poke, push/ strike, hit [at, on, back]." Gerleman accentuates the aspect of "bouncing back" concomitant with the understanding of apotropaic ritual. 1 K. 18:21 is to be associated with the notion of "bumping/striking against two sides" instead of with the notion (excluded by 18:26) of "limping on both sides" or "jumping on two crutches" *(s^e'ippîm).*[10] The continuation with double *l^ekû 'aḥ^arāyw* associates *psḥ* with the idea of movement. V. 26 picks up on this with *way^epass^eḥû 'al-hammizbēaḥ.* The intensive form incorporates this bumping or striking against the altar into the notion of successively different movements.[11] Hence rather than a cultic ritual involving repeated running against the altar,[12] one ought probably to associate this with bumping injuries resulting from the participants running around excitedly (cf. LXX).

In Isa. 31:5 the notion of thwarting the enemy *(pāsōaḥ w^ehamlêṭ)*[13] refers to defensive and protective measures (par. *gānôn w^ehaṣṣêl*) undertaken on Jerusalem's behalf. The orientation of 31:5 to the meaning "walk with a limp" or "pass by"[14] makes sense only if the *pesaḥ* was transferred here to Jerusalem in the form of the family ritual attested in Ex. 12:(1-14,)21-23. H. Barth thus presupposes that the *pesaḥ* was centralized in Jerusalem. One cannot adduce Dt. 16:1-7(,8) in support of this view, however, since it

1. Glasson; B. Kedar, *Biblische Semantik* (Stuttgart, 1981), 96-97.
2. Blau, 243-44.
3. *GesB,* 650; *KBL*², 769.
4. *HAL,* III, 947.
5. Keel, 428-33; Ros-Garmendia, 149-50.
6. *HP,* 140.
7. Keel, 429.
8. See already Redslob, 25-26.
9. See also H. Wildberger, *Jesaja. BK* X/3 (1982), 1237.
10. See in this regard Gerleman, 411-12, contra P. Joüon, *MUSJ* 3 (1908) 336.
11. See *HP,* 151-54.
12. See Gerleman, 411.
13. *GK,* §133t.
14. H. Barth, *Die Jesaja-Worte in der Josiazeit. WMANT* 48 (1977), 78, 88-90.

in its own turn draws from Ex. 12. The derivation of *psḥ* in Isa. 31:5 from *pesaḥ* ("celebrate a Passover"[15]) makes a virtue out of the vice of such exegesis, one that understands *psḥ* in 31:5 from the perspective of the *pesaḥ* ritual. Isa. 31:5 needs to be interpreted from the perspective of the semantics of *psḥ* itself quite independent of any *pesaḥ* ritual.

The basic meaning of *psḥ* as "push, shove, hit," also explains the occurrence (niphal) in 2 S. 4:4 of *wayyippōl wayyippāsēaḥ* in a reflexive sense as "hit, bump oneself."[16] The result is that the child's legs become lame *(nᵉḵēh raḡlayim).*

A connection thus emerges with the verbal adj. *pissēaḥ,* which like other adjectives denoting physical or mental defects is formed according to the *qiṭṭēl* type.[17] A defect noted in this way, namely, one resulting from "being hit, bumped," can be contextually deduced (→ פסח *pissēaḥ*). The translation "lame" is too narrow for the meaning of *pissēaḥ,* which is not restricted to certain body parts, and should encompass any form of defect to the body's extremities caused by bumping or hitting.[18]

The Heb. *psḥ* and Akk. *pessû(m)* are historically related,[19] the latter referring, like *pissēaḥ,* to external bodily injuries or visual impairment with regard to either human beings or animals. Restricting the semantic connotations to "lame" and "limping" results from understanding Heb. *pissēaḥ* itself too narrowly,[20] since the reference is more comprehensive and includes any form of injury.[21] Hebrew lexicography merely engages in circular argumentation when it adduces Akk. *pessû(m)* in the meaning "lame"/"limping" in support of translating the Heb. root *psḥ* as "lame"/"limping" while simultaneously deriving the Akkadian term itself from a corresponding understanding of Heb. *pissēaḥ.*

The PN *pāsēaḥ* derives from *psḥ* and occurs in 1 Ch. 4:12; Ezr. 2:49; Neh. 3:6; 7:51.[22] The understanding of this name as "hobbler" is rather unlikely for a birth name.[23] Such a name might rather be an expression of strength and recall the unborn's kicking or pushing in the womb (see Gen. 25:22-23). The PN *psḥn* is found in Ugarit,[24] though these texts offer no clues regarding the meaning of the name.

The term *psḥ* and Arab. *fasaḫa,* "to dislocate, put out of joint,"[25] are also historically related.

The basic meaning of *psḥ* as "punch, bump, kick," encompasses two related perspec-

---

15. Riedel, 322-23; J. Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem Jahwes Königssitz. SANT* 7 (1963), 247-52.
16. Gerleman, 411.
17. *GK,* §84ᵇa, c.
18. See Otto, *BN* 41 (1988) 41.
19. *AHw,* II, 856-57; see in this regard W. W. Hallo, "The Lame and the Halt," *FS W. F. Albright. ErIsr* 9 (1969), 66-70.
20. See *AHw,* II, 856.
21. See merely *RMA* 235 A r. 5: *issu ina libbi pessāti.*
22. See also the inscriptional evidence for *psḥ* from seals: N. Avigad, "Group of Hebrew Seals" (Heb. with Eng. summary), *ErIsr* 9 (1969) I; F. Vattioni, "I sigilli ebraici," *Bibl* 50 (1969) 384, seal no. 235.
23. *IPN,* no. 227; *HAL,* III, 948.
24. *KTU* 4.63 III 42; 4.343.2.
25. *HAL,* III, 947.

tives:[26] external movement against the resistance of an object (1 K. 18:26) or sphere of power (18:21), as well as, from the opposite perspective, the rejection or thwarting of such movement coming from the outside, such as that of an attacking enemy (Isa. 31:5). This basic meaning also throws light on the occurrences in which *psḥ* is associated with the *pesaḥ* ritual (Ex. 12:13,23,27). The smearing of blood on the entrances to houses (12:7,13a,22) is why in the original version *hammašḥîṯ* and in the later version Yahweh[27] encounter resistance at the entrances to the houses (*pāsaḥ 'al-happeṯaḥ*, v. 23 [v. 27: *'al-bātê bᵉnê yiśrā'ēl;* v. 13: *'ᵃlêḵem*]), thus preventing the destruction or slaying *(ngp)* of the inhabitants (v. 13: *wᵉlō' yihyeh bāḵem negep lᵉmašḥîṯ;* v. 23: *wᵉlō' yittēn hammašḥîṯ lāḇô' 'el-bātêḵem lingōp;* v. 27: *wᵉ'eṯ-bātênû hiṣṣîl*). The semantic proximity of *psḥ* and *ngp* emerges in these passages,[28] with *psḥ* referring to hitting or bumping from the perspective of the person doing the striking or bumping. Here the semantic focus is on the resistance encountered by that person and the potential consequences in the form of injury to that person (see 2 S. 4:4 as well as the semantic spectrum of *pissēaḥ*). By contrast, *ngp* refers to the striking from the perspective of the person struck. Here the semantic focus is on the aspect of injury to or even destruction of the person struck.

2. *pesaḥ*. Two different explanations for the meaning of the subst. *pesaḥ* have been offered.[29] Derivations from the verb *psḥ* draw support from the interpretations of *pesaḥ* in Ex. 12:13,23,27, a derivation some scholars view as merely a secondary, popular-etymological association of what are actually historically unrelated lexemes, and attempt instead to derive the meaning of *pesaḥ* from a historical consideration of Israel's environs.

Scholars interpret *pesaḥ* variously as a rite of passage,[30] a lunar festival,[31] an apotropaic ritual,[32] or as an inspection ritual,[33] and draw support from the meaning of *psḥ* as "pass by"/"spare"; others interpret it as a ritual hobble dance[34] portraying the exodus,[35] as a lunar dance,[36] or as a fertility rite deriving from the fertility leaps of the he-goat.[37] Along these interpretive lines, Keel has explained *pesaḥ* with reference to the wild jumping and leaping of the demons and to the apotropaic ritual through which one attempted to protect oneself from them.[38] By contrast, Gerleman derives *pesaḥ* from *psḥ* as an apotropaic "bouncing back, ricocheting."

---

26. See G. Fohrer, "Zweifache Aspekte hebräischer Wörter," *Studien zu alttestamentlichen Texten und Themen (1966-1972). BZAW* 155 (1981), 203ff.
27. See II.3 below.
28. See Gerleman, 412.
29. See the survey in Ros-Garmendia, 146-51.
30. König, 298.
31. Benzinger, 382.
32. Kraus, *Worship in Israel*, 46.
33. Segal, 185-87.
34. Engnell, *OrS* 1 (1952) 46.
35. Ringgren, 167-68.
36. W. Graf, "Tanz," *LThK*, IX, 1292.
37. Beer, *Pesachim (Ostern)*, 13-14; see the survey in Laaf, 143-44.
38. Keel, 432-33.

The semantic connotation of *psḥ* as "push/strike/hit at/against/back" interprets the blood ritual of *pesaḥ*. From the perspective of the person seeking protection, the *pesaḥ* ritual involves striking back at or thwarting the power of the blow *(ngp)* (from either *mašḥîṯ* or Yahweh); from the perspective of precisely this power, it involves the counterstrike against the power of blood obstructing that blow.

Considered against explanations of *pesaḥ* from the root *psḥ* in Ex. 12:13,23,27, those theses are of little value that derive *pesaḥ* from various other sources. Such include Akk. *pašāḫu,* "cool off/calm,"[39] and the possibly related Arab. *fasuḥa,* "be roomy, spacious,"[40] Arab. *faṣaha,* "be long-/farsighted, clear" (i.e., atmospheric clarity provided by the illumination of the full moon > *pesaḥ*[41]), Arab. *fasḥa,* "part, piece; salted meat,"[42] Syr. *pᵉṣaḥ,* "be happy, gay,"[43] or Egyp. *(pꜣ) ꜣsḥ,* "harvest,"[44] *(pꜣ) sḥꜣ,* "remembrance, memory,"[45] *(pꜣ) sḥ,* "blow, stroke."[46]

These derivations collapse if *pesaḥ* can be associated with the verb *psḥ* in a way also explaining the Passover ritual itself such that the explanations in Ex. 12:13,23,27 emerge not as a popular-etymological association of two originally separate lexemes, but as appropriate substantive explanations attesting a historical connection between *psḥ* and *pesaḥ*. The basic meaning of *pesaḥ* then expands to refer to the cultic observance during the night of Passover — in early traditions quite independent of the seven-day Feast of Unleavened Bread,[47] and after the two observances came to be associated[48] it then functioned as a delimitation from the Feast of Unleavened Bread:[49] *pesaḥ lᵉyhwh* (Ex. 12:11; Lev. 23:5; Nu. 28:16); *ʿāśâ (ʾeṯ-) happesaḥ* (Nu. 9:2,4-6,13; Josh. 5:10; 2 K. 23:22; 2 Ch. 30:2; 35:16-17; Ezr. 6:19); *ḥag happesaḥ* (Ex. 34:25b); *happāsaḥ ḥag* (Ezk. 45:21);[50] *mimmoḥᵒraṯ happesaḥ* (Josh. 5:11; Nu. 33:3). It was only in popular usage during the late Israelite period that Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread came to be designated collectively as *pesaḥ* (Josephus *Ant.* 9.13.3 §271; 14.2.1 §21; *B.J.* 2.1.3 §10; Lk. 22:1).[51]

---

39. *AHw,* II, 840; see A. Jeremias, II, 102 n. 5; a different view is taken by Riedel, 324; for additional bibliog. see Laaf, 145 n. 93.

40. See L. Kopf, "Arabische Etymologien und Parallelen zum Bibelwörterbuch," *VT* 8 (1958) 194-95.

41. See J. Gray, *I & II Kings. OTL* (²1970), 740.

42. Fraenkel, 647.

43. See R. Payne Smith, *Thesaurus Syriacus,* II (1901), 3208.

44. Riedel, 326-29; Völter, *Passah und Mazzoth und ihr ägyptisches Urbild,* 10ff.; a different view is taken by Couroyer, 486-87 n. 6.

45. F. Hommel, *Die altisraelitische Überlieferung in inschriftlicher Beleuchtung* (1897), 292-93; P. Buis and J. Leclercq, *Le Deutéronome* (Paris, 1963), 123; a different view is taken by Couroyer, 487-88.

46. Couroyer; Barr, *CPT,* 103, 333; Laaf, 146-47; a different view is taken by de Vaux, *AncIsr,* 488; J. B. Segal, 100; Keel, 431.

47. See II.1 below.

48. See II.2 below.

49. See II.3-6 below.

50. But see *BHS.*

51. Jeremias, *TDNT,* V, 898.

The term *pesaḥ* can also be transferred to the animal slaughtered in this cultic observance: *šḥṭ happesaḥ* in Ex. 12:21; 2 Ch. 30:15; 35:1,6,11; Ezr. 6:20; *zbḥ pesaḥ lᵉyhwh* in Dt. 16:2,5-6; cf. Ex. 12:27 with *zeḇaḥ pesaḥ;* Ex. 34:25 with *zeḇaḥ ḥag happāsaḥ;* pl. *happᵉsāḥîm,* "sacrificial animals," in 2 Ch. 30:17; 35:7-8, *'āḵal 'eṯ-happesaḥ* in 2 Ch. 30:18.

3. *Translations.* The LXX translates *pāsaḥ* in Ex. 12:13 and 27 as *skepázein,* "protect" (Vulg. *protegam*), and in 12:23 as *parérchesthai,* "pass by" (Vulg. *pertransibit*), and *pāsōaḥ* in Isa. 31:5 as *peripoiḗsetai,* "rescue." The translation as *parérchesthai* is deduced from the context (*'āḇar* in Ex. 12:23; cf. 12:12).

This translation is adopted in Jub. 49:3 by Ezechielos[52] and Vulg. (Ex. 12:13,27: *transibo/transivit;* Ex. 12:23: *transcendit;* Isa. 31:5: *transiens*[53]). Beyond the context of Ex. 12, the notion of protection might have derived from Isa. 31:5, whence it influenced the translation of *psḥ* as *ḥws,* "to spare," in Tg. Onq. Ex. 12:13,23(,27); Tg. Jon. Ex. 12:13(,27); Tg. Ps.-J. Ex. 12:13(,27). The marginal notes in Tg. Ps.-J. Ex. 12:13,23,27 explicate *psḥ* variously with *gnn* (*'aph: 'aggên;* cf. Isa. 31:5). In Syriac, Palestinian, and Babylonian targumic traditions, *'aggên* became a technical term for protective divine intervention and deliverance.[54] The translation of *psḥ* as *dḥs,* "press/push," in Tg. Onq. Ex. 12:27 deviates from LXX and targumic evidence and attests a nuance related to Heb. *psḥ.*

The Syr. version adopts Heb. *psḥ* as *'apṣaḥ,* though the question remains why it was rendered causatively. Syriac comms. associate *'apṣaḥ* with *pᵉṣāḥā,* "joy," by way of popular etymology.

The LXX transliterates Heb. *pesaḥ* as *phásek/phásech* (2 Ch. 30; 35), Aram. *pasḥā'* (late form *pisḥā'*[55]) as *páscha;* so also Philo, the NT, Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion.[56] The interpretation reflected in the translation of *psḥ* as *parérchesthai* in the LXX also influenced Philo's translation of *pesaḥ* as *diábasis/diabatḗria.*[57] The interpretation of *psḥ* as "protect" in the LXX translation of Ex. 12:13 and 27 influenced Symmachus's translation of *pesaḥ* as *hypermáchēsis,* "defense." Tg. Onq. Ex. 12:27 translates *pesaḥ* as *ḥayis* (Tg. Ps.-J.: *ḥᵃyāsā'*), "considerate treatment, sparing."

II. History of *pesaḥ*.

1. *Family Ritual.* The text of Ex. 12:1-14, to be ascribed to P, has preserved in 12:3b*,6b*,7a,8a,11bβ a ritual tradition formulated in the third person plural distinguishable from the later, second-person addendum.[58] In this larger ritual tradition, vv. 7b and 8b are somewhat redundant and represent later addenda. The same applies to

52. See A. M. Denis, ed., *Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece,* III (1970), 213.
53. See also Jerome, in J.-P. Migne, *Patrologia Latina,* 36, 190.
54. Brock, 26-34.
55. See Jeremias, *TDNT,* V, 896-97 n. 2, contra Riedel, 325 n. 1.
56. Concerning the rare form φάσκα, see Jeremias, *TDNT,* V, 896-97.
57. Philo *Leg.* 3.94 et passim.
58. Arguments in Laaf, 10-16 (with bibliog.).

the end of v. 3, *śeh labbāyiṯ*. The insertion of vv. 4-6a made it necessary in v. 6b to specify the subject by inserting *kol-qᵉhal ʿᵃdaṯ yiśrāʾēl.*

The original text of the ritual was as follows:

wᵉ[lā]qᵉḥû lāhem ʾîš śeh lᵉḇêṯ-ʾāḇôṯ
wᵉšāḥᵃṭû ʾōṯô bên hāʿarbāyim
wᵉlāqᵉḥû min-haddām
wᵉnāṯᵉnû ʿal-šᵉtê hammᵉzûzōṯ wᵉʿal-hammašqôp
wᵉʾāḵᵉlû ʾeṯ-habbāśār ballaylâ hazzeh
pesaḥ hû lᵉyhwh

This text is organized in a series of *w-qaṭal*-x statements. The prefix-conjugation form in v. 3b results from the loss of the verb's initial position through the insertion of *beʿāśôr laḥōḏeš hazzeh*. Compared with this textual stage, the parallel in 12:21b-23 already exhibits a stage of transmission more comprehensively developed in the blood ritual, more strongly structured in its language, and expanded by an interpretive section. Only the *pesaḥ* meal in 12:8a points beyond 12:21b-23, though we can no longer decide whether this text reflects a later development of a pure blood ritual, or whether this particular motif was deleted from 12:21b-23 at a later stage. As a family ritual, this *pesaḥ* clearly differs from Dt. 16:1-7(8) and the later Priestly redaction. Whereas the redactional stratum in Ex. 12:1-14 picks up and corrects Dt. 16:1ff.,[59] Ex. 12:3b*,6b*,7a,8a,11bβ exhibits neither Dtn nor P influence, but does indeed closely parallel Ex. 12:21b-23, suggesting that 12:3b*,6b*,7a,8a,11bβ is to be dated to the pre-Dtn period and may represent an extremely old *pesaḥ* tradition within the OT. The emphatic association of the ritual with Yahweh in v. 11bβ suggests that the ritual may originally not have been associated with Yahweh at all.[60]

Ex. 12:21-23(24-27a),27b interrupts the Yahwistic narrative of the tenth plague. The integration of 12:21b-23 into the narrative context by 12:21a and 27b exhibits Yahwistic[61] or Yehowistic[62] features (cf. the *zᵉqēnîm* as Israel's representatives; *wayyiqqōḏ hāʿām wayyištaḥᵃwû*, Gen. 24:26,48; 43:28; Ex. 4:31; 34:8; Nu. 22:31). The present text of Ex. 12:21b-23 is structured through opening imperatives that in their own turn are continued through *w-qaṭal*-x statements.[63] These *w-qaṭal*-x statements are subdivided by a *w*-x-*yiqṭōl* statement (v. 22b).[64] The ritual instructions themselves are thus set off in relief from the interpretive action of the ritual (v. 23), which is-

59. See II.3 below.
60. See Haran, *Temples and Temple-Service,* 317 n. 2.
61. Laaf, 19-21.
62. Schreiner, 75-80.
63. Concerning this functional process of content and expression in the future sense of the subordinate clause, see R. Bartelmus, "Hyh: Bedeutung und Funktion einer hebräischen 'Allerweltswortes,'" *Arbeiten zu Text und Sprache im AT* 17 (1982) 73ff.
64. Concerning the function of interrupting a series of progressives, see W. Gross, "Otto Rössler und die Diskussion um das althebräische Verbalsystem," *BN* 18 (1982) 66.

sues in a definition of the ritual's purpose formulated as a *w-yiqṭōl*-x statement:[65] *wᵉlō' yittēn hammašḥîṯ lāḇô' 'el-bātêḵem lingōp.*

Both the ritual itself and its interpretation have been molded into a coherent structure through language. Similarly, the ritual is also organized into a unit through temporal specifications beginning in v. 21b with the morning *(mišḵû)*[66] and continuing to the following morning in v. 22b *('aḏ-bōqer).* V. 22 as the goal of the ritual section and v. 23b as the goal of the interpretive section are related through the motifs of not leaving one's house and of not allowing destruction to enter the house. The textual tradition in 12:21b-23 thus has the following structure:

Ritual:
imperative statements
w-qaṭal-x statements
w-x-*yiqṭōl* statement (mark of separation)

Interpretation:
w-qaṭal-x statements
w-yiqṭōl-x statement (final determination)

Because the structural coherency at the linguistic level enables one to delimit the textual tradition both forward and backward, attempts to make literary-critical distinctions within 12:21b-23[67] become less persuasive.

A determination of the ritual's function can pick up on the interpretation of the ritual in 12:23. This interpretation concludes with *wᵉlō' yittēn hammašḥîṯ lāḇô' 'el-bātêḵem lingōp,* specifying the protection of the family as the purpose of the ritual. The form of this final determination as a *w-yiqṭōl*-x statement, clearly distinguished from the context of the *w-qaṭal*-x statements as it is, emphasizes that this statement is not a secondary narrative element within the flow of the salvific interpretation of the exodus, but rather a statement of purpose emphasized as an independent interpretive element.

This statement of purpose militates against those interpretations that understand 12:21b-23 as a ritual of purification and atonement on the basis of the blood ritual and associate the literary disposition of 12:21-23 with that of 12:1-4 (P)[68] or understand it as part of the redaction of 12:1-14.[69] These theses cannot adduce in support the use of the term *ng'*, since whenever *ng'* refers to atoning rituals (Nu. 19:18; Isa. 6:7; Jer. 1:9-

---

65. Concerning this function of the final clause, see F. T. Kelly, "The Imperfect with Simple Waw in Hebrew," *JBL* 39 (1920) 3-4.

66. See W. von Soden, "Zum hebräischen Wörterbuch," *Bibel und Alter Orient. BZAW* 162 (1985), 201-2.

67. See among others P. Weimar, *Die Meerwundererzählung: Ägypten und AT* 9 (1985), 131, who discerns a "Yehowistic insertion" in Ex. 12:21,22a,23bβ,27b.

68. May, 65-82; Wambacq, *Bibl* 57 (1976), part 2, here: "suite et fin," 316-19; Van Seters, 172-75.

69. Norin, 173-76; Lindström, 55-73.

10 is concerned rather with the surrendering of power), its function is explicitly noted. In Ex. 12:22 *ng'* is introduced because of its similarity in both sound and meaning with the verbs *ngp* (12:23) and *ngḥ*, "butt, thrust, hit," which are themselves semantically related to the verb *psḥ*.[70] It was not until the time of the Priestly redaction of 12:1-14 that terminology of the atoning blood ritual could have been adopted with the change from *ng'* to *ntn* (12:7).[71] The depersonalizing reinterpretation of *mašḥîṯ* (12:23) into an action *(lᵉmašḥîṯ)* also supports the thesis that textual development moved from 12:21b-23 to 12:1-14 rather than in the reverse direction; this development must deal with a secondary personification of the *mašḥîṯ* as a hypostasis of Yahweh and the concomitant proximity to the late Jewish doctrine of angels.[72] The understanding of 12:21b-23 as a ritual of purification and atonement cannot explain the ritual's designation as *pesaḥ* and must instead revert to the thesis of some as yet unexplained etymology of *pesaḥ*.[73]

Ex. 12:21b-23 describes *pesaḥ* as a blood ritual to be performed within the *mišpāḥâ* for the sake of protecting the family in its house during the night of the ritual. The influence of the exodus tradition is restricted to the interpretive section in 12:23 *(lingōp 'eṯ-miṣrayim)*. The explicit function of protecting the family is accompanied implicitly by a remembrance of the night of the exodus, and this exodus motif is accordingly formulated similar to the determination of purpose: *lingōp 'eṯ-miṣrayim/'el-bātêḵem lingōp*. In contrast to the ritual section, the interpretive section of 12:23 still exhibits traces of the historical change in the understanding of the early *pesaḥ* ritual in that 12:23a *('āḇar yhwh . . . lingōp)* strikingly does not mention the *mašḥîṯ* who, after all, delivers the annihilating blow in 12:23bβ. Ex. 12:23bα does not fit with the continuation in 12:23bβ. According to 12:23bα, Yahweh encounters resistance *(psḥ)* at the threshold and cannot strike *(ngp)*, while in the continuation Yahweh prevents the *mašḥîṯ* from entering the house. The archaic notions of unyielding resistance *(psḥ)*, of protection and deception by means of blood as an expression of death that has already violently taken its toll on the living,[74] do not really fit Yahweh; they do, however, fit the *mašḥîṯ* as the embodiment of destructive power still preserved in 12:23bβ as a "dulled motif." The renewed introduction of Yahweh at precisely this point is all the more striking and betrays an emphatic reinterpretation. The ritual's interpretive section thus reveals an even older interpretation that understood the ritual as a means of protecting the family from the *mašḥîṯ* during the night of its performance. This protection is based on the power of the blood and deception in preventing the *mašḥîṯ* from entering the house.

This preliterary stage of 12:21b-23 attests a traditional, archaic level of religion far removed from any rationalized, unified view of life under the idea of God. This ritual originated neither within the high-god religions of Israel's Syrian-Canaanite surroundings, which do not attest such blood rituals in any case, nor within Israel's own religion

---

70. See I.1 above.
71. Füglister, 98.
72. Norin, 175-76; Lindström, 59-65.
73. Lindström, 69-70 n. 39.
74. H. Christ, *Blutvergiessen im AT* (Basel, 1977), 131-33.

of Yahweh. As an apotropaic family ritual, the *pesaḥ* ritual derives from the locally bound (stationary nomadic), family-structured, proto-Israelite livestock culture. From the perspective of cultural history, this archaic culture was a late bloomer, out of synchrony with the otherwise highly complex surrounding world, and within it the function of religion in securing the survival of the family had not yet been articulated in any systematic, rationally mediated expression. The recital of patriarchal stories portraying dangerous situations such as the fording of a river (Gen. 32:23-33*) helped secure for the present generation the power of the familial god discernible in the ancestor himself[75] and thus functioned as a form of protection *alongside* the blood ritual of the *pesaḥ*. The rationalizing power of the Yahweh religion first associated these different religious events with a single God as a remembrance of this God's history with his people, a history that unified the various groups out of which Israel itself was formed.

Henninger interprets *pesaḥ* as a shepherd's festival with a religio-historical parallel in the spring festival of the *raǵab* Arabic bedouin (a view already proposed by Ewald[76] and Wellhausen[77]) and thus as a festival ultimately focused on the sacrifice of the firstborn.[78] This sacrifice then allegedly came to be associated with the celestial creator god El during the pre-Islamic period. This association of the shepherd's ritual with the idea of the high God resembles W. Schmidt's religio-historical thesis of nomadic monotheism,[79] but encounters problems in that any understanding of *pesaḥ* as a sacrifice of the firstborn must be based on later traditions of the Feast of Unleavened Bread (Ex. 13:11-16; 34:19-20). The analogy between proto-Israelite shepherds and Arabic bedouin cannot be sustained.

Nor does 12:21b-23 give any indication that the *pesaḥ* ritual is to be associated with the change of pastures.[80] According to 12:22, this ritual was performed at night. Later dating to the night of the 14th/15th of the first month (Lev. 23:5; Ezk. 45:21; Ex. 12:6) might be recalling that the nocturnal *pesaḥ* ritual occurred during the night of the spring full moon. The days and nights of the full moon were considered to be especially dangerous during the spring month (Prov. 7:20),[81] and to require a correspondingly powerful ritual for thwarting danger.

The Yahwistic tradition of Ex. 12:21b-23 unites the ritual and its interpretation in a linguistically coherent structure. Here too the ritual serves to protect the family; in this version Yahweh himself prevents the *mašḥîṯ* from entering the houses. The ritual places the reader in the situation of the exodus night and functions to evoke that situation. The protection of the family is now complemented by the destruction of Israel's

---

75. E. Otto, *Jakob in Sichem. BWANT* 110 (1979), 40ff.
76. "De feriarum," 418-19.
77. *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* (reprint of 1885 ed., Atlanta, 1994), 87ff.
78. "Les fêtes de printemps," 36ff. (with bibliog.).
79. *Der Ursprung der Gottesidee*, I (^{2}1926), 670-74.
80. So Rost, "Weidewechsel"; Laaf, 148-58; see by contrast Schreiner, 72-73; Otto, *TRE*, XI, 97-98.
81. See S. Langdon, *Babylonian Menologies and the Semitic Calendars* (London, 1935), 77, 92-95.

enemies (12:23a: *w^e'āḇar yhwh lingōp 'eṯ-miṣrayim*), an aspect already transcending the ritual's original familial focus and, commensurate with the association of the ritual with the exodus, now focusing on the protection of the people of Israel. The association of the ritual with Israel's idea of God subjects it to the same universalizing and rationalizing-unifying influence that Yahweh had on Israel's understanding of experience and its view of the world. In this tradition there is no negative power independent of Yahweh. The *mašḥîṯ* is a tool Yahweh uses to destroy Israel's enemies.

Ex. 12:23 presupposes a familiarity with a narrative of the exodus night that is both related to and clearly different from the pre-Priestly tradition of the tenth plague serving as an etiology of the ritual of the Feast of Unleavened Bread.[82] According to 12:22, no Israelite is allowed to leave his or her house until the next morning, whereas according to 12:31 Moses is called to Pharaoh during the middle of the night. Although according to 12:29ff. the Egyptians made the Israelites leave the country so fast that the latter had no time to see about proper provisioning, this context knows nothing about any prohibition against leaving the house before daybreak. Vv. 21b-23 nowhere refer to the killing of the firstborn, just as in a reverse fashion the announcement and execution of the plague in the plague narrative says nothing about any special provisions for sparing the Israelites. The introduction of the exodus theme into the interpretive section of the tradition in 12:21b-23, similar to the narrative of the tenth plague, betrays an association of the traditions of the Feast of Unleavened Bread and of *pesaḥ* based on the confluence of these two cultic observances.

The dating of this event draws from the understanding of the relationship between Ex. 12:21b-23 and the tradition in Dt. 16:1-7(8), in which the association of *pesaḥ* and the Feast of Unleavened Bread is made explicit.[83] The association of *pesaḥ* with the family suggests that Ex. 12:21b-23 belongs either to the pre- or posthistory of Dt. 16:1-8. The form-critical and semantic distance from the P tradition in Ex. 12:1-14, as well as the non-Dtr form of 12:21b-23 and of the redactional framework 12:21a and 27b, all suggest that 12:21b-23 witnesses to the prehistory of Dt. 16:1-8. The incorporation of the exodus theme into a ritual bound to the family contradicts the attempt to differentiate formally between familial religion and official religion such that, by drawing attention to the themes associated with the various expressions of religion, one can assert that the great salvific-historical themes can be understood only as the expression of official religion.[84] One must differentiate rather between different *functions* of one and the same tradition within the family and the larger community transcending that family (cf. Ex. 12:21b-23 with 15:2-18). In 12:21-23 the exodus tradition serves the function of protecting the family.

2. *Dtn Reform Program.* The focus of Dt. 16:1-7(8), namely, to associate the traditions of *pesaḥ* and the Feast of Unleavened Bread with one another, also influences the passage's structure at the linguistic level. Following the exhortation to observe

82. On the date see Otto, *VT* 26 (1976) 3-27; Van Seters, 175-76, assigns it to the exilic period.

83. See II.2 below.

84. R. Albertz, *Persönliche Frömmigkeit und offizielle Religion. CThM* (1978), 179.

(šāmôr)[85] the *ḥōḏeš hā'āḇîḇ,* statements in the form of *wᵉqaṭal* shape the framework in 16:1aβb,2,7, encompassing a series of structured *yiqṭōl* statements in vv. 3-6, with vv. 3-5 formulated as prohibitions with concomitant negation underscoring the positive commandment. The corresponding opposition *lō'-tō'ḵal ḥāmēṣ/tō'ḵal maṣṣôṯ* is also expressed in the syntactical juxtaposition of *yiqṭōl*-x/x-*yiqṭōl* statements and does not require any oppositional particle in contrast to the noncorresponding structure of vv. 5-6.[86] The shared structure of vv. 3/5-6 associates the instructions for the Feast of Unleavened Bread with those for Passover and at the same time encompasses v. 4, which links the commandments for the Feast of Unleavened Bread and Passover:

Framework: Passover Instructions:

1aα	inf. abs.
1aβb,2	*w-qaṭal* statements

Instructions for the Feast of Unleavened Bread:

3	*yiqṭōl*-x
	x-*yiqṭōl*
4	*w-yiqṭōl*-x

Passover Instructions:

	w-yiqṭōl-x
5,6	*yiqṭōl*-x
	x-*yiqṭōl*

Framework: Passover Instructions:

7	*w-qaṭal* statements

The framework in vv. 1aβb,2,7 contains the decisive innovations for the *pesaḥ:* its displacement to the *ḥōḏeš hā'āḇîḇ,* the date of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, its reinterpretation into a *zeḇaḥ* for which larger livestock *(bāqār)* are also slaughtered and their meat boiled (see 12:21),[87] and finally the centralization of the *pesaḥ* at the sanctuary chosen by Yahweh. In the final form of the text, the Passover instructions constitute the framework for the tradition of the Feast of Unleavened Bread.

This text exhibits traces of its growth through the course of tradition. In the present context the isolated position of 16:8 serves to connect 16:1-7 with the following commandment concerning the week-long festival and preserves in the six/seven schema an old motif from the Feast of Unleavened Bread (Ex. 13:6);[88] this isolated position together with the interruption of the context of Dt. 16:4a,8 by vv. 4b,5-7 suggests that the demand for centralization on the one hand and the Passover material on the other were

85. *GK,* §113.4.
86. Y. Thorion, *Studien zur klassischen hebräischen Syntax* (Berlin, 1984), 22-27.
87. R. P. Merendino, *Das deuteronomische Gesetz. BBB* 31 (1969), 128.
88. See Braulik, *TP* 56 (1981) 345 nn. 34, 38.

incorporated into a tradition associated with the Feast of Unleavened Bread providing the framework in a diachronic perspective. The parallels to Dt. 16:1 in Ex. 23:15 and 34:18 show that the Passover material in v. 1bβ as well as the awkwardly placed *laylâ* at the end of v. 1 are secondary elements of the reinterpretation of a tradition associated with the Feast of Unleavened Bread. The reference back from v. 3 to v. 2 through *ʿālāyw* can be seen to be secondary insofar as the uneven context emerges in which one is to eat unleavened bread at Passover for seven days even though Passover may not extend overnight. The original text associated with the Feast of Unleavened Bread thus encompasses Dt. 16:1aαb*,3*,4a(8), into which 16:1aβ,b(end),3(*ʿālāyw*),4b,5-7 were inserted. The hotly debated question whether the instructions for the Feast of Unleavened Bread or for Passover take priority[89] resolves itself in the distinction between synchronic and diachronic perspectives. From the perspective of the historical textual tradition, the tradition of the Feast of Unleavened Bread provides the original framework that the Passover material then complements, yet in the resulting final form of the text it is these Passover instructions that then frame the tradition of the Feast of Unleavened Bread.

The difference between Dt. 16:3 and 16:8 suggests that the textual tradition of the Feast of Unleavened Bread itself underwent development within tradition history. The substitution of *ʿaṣereṯ*[90] for an original *ḥag* (Ex. 13:6) excepts this holiday from the enjoinment for centralization.[91] Dt. 16:1aβ,5-7 has been formulated completely from the Dtn perspective; only in v. 4b does it incorporate older tradition (Ex. 23:18; 34:25a) and still preserve in the motif of the nocturnal celebration the connection with the original family ritual. Suggestions for reconstructing the textual history of Dt. 16:1-7(8) diverge so greatly because the redactors of this text did indeed attain their goal of combining *pesaḥ* and the Feast of Unleavened Bread, and in so doing shaped the present textual form of 16:1-7.[92]

The theses that understand the Feast of Unleavened Bread as an agricultural evocation of *pesaḥ*[93] or *pesaḥ* as the Dtn continuation of the Feast of Unleavened Bread[94] exclude one another even though they do agree in justifiably rejecting the notion that the Feast of Unleavened Bread is of Canaanite origin.[95]

Whereas the Unleavened Bread motif is closely associated with a remembrance of the exodus in a "memorial to suffering,"[96] the exodus theme in 16:1,6(end) is only loosely connected with the *pesaḥ* theme. And whereas the traditions of the Feast of Unleavened Bread do not mention the theme of centralization, the *pesaḥ* instructions are intimately associated with it (16:2,5,7-8). The framework encompasses the instructions for the Pass-

---

89. See in this regard Cholewiński, *Heiligkeitsgesetz*, 179-89; Halbe, *ZAW* 87 (1975) 147-68.
90. M. Caloz, "Exode XIII,3-16 et le Deutéronome," *RB* 75 (1968) 57.
91. See the survey of the discussion concerning v. 8 in Cholewiński, *Heiligkeitsgesetz*, 186-87 n. 32.
92. See H.-D. Preuss, *Deuteronomium. EdF* 164 (1982), 135-36, with bibliog.
93. Halbe, *ZAW* 87 (1975) 324-46.
94. Wambacq, *Bibl* 62 (1981) 499-518.
95. See Wambacq, *Bibl* 61 (1980) 31-54; Otto, *TRE*, XI, 96-97.
96. Braulik, *TP* 56 (1981) 335-57.

over night (see v. 2 alongside v. 6, *tizbaḥ 'eṯ-happesaḥ bā'āreḇ kᵉḇô' haššemeš*), whereas the seven-day eating of unleavened bread extends into daily life as a means of fostering the remembrance of the exodus within the entirety of daily life.[97] Although the incorporation of the family celebration of *pesaḥ* into the official cult of the centralized pilgrim festivals does indeed alter *pesaḥ*, it also attests how the official cult itself changed from a state cult to the postexilic worship service. The function of protecting the family unit (Ex. 12:23) is replaced by the individual's remembrance of the exodus *lᵉma'an tizkōr 'eṯ-yôm ṣē'ṯᵉkā mē'ereṣ miṣrayim kol-yᵉmê ḥayyeyḵā* (Dt. 16:3). Although the connection with the family unit as the celebrating subject is sundered, the individual Israelite as a part of the people in the larger sense now becomes the focal point, and because this function of protecting the family is no longer an issue, so also does the significance of the blood ritual recede. It is replaced by the *zeḇaḥ* (see Ex. 34:25 [Dtr redaction]), which now reverses the original focus on the family in a move toward individualization and integrates Israel in the larger sense as a sacrificial community; the second-person singular form of address now also refers to Israel as a whole (see Dt. 27:6-7).

The open question is whether this reform program was part of the presuppositions for a Josianic reform of *pesaḥ* (2 K. 23:21-23; 2 Ch. 35:1-19), was the reflex of such a reform, or was itself an exilic reform program intended for a future Israel.[98] The reform account in 2 K. 23:21-23 is dependent on Dt. 16:1-8, and in contesting the assertion of Dtr authorship in 2 K. 23:21-23,[99] N. Lohfink has shown that 2 K. 23:21-23 is actually part of the literary (i.e., pre-Dtr) basis of the reform account in 2 K. 22:3–23:3.[100] In any event, quite independent of the literary-historical questions concerning 2 K. 23:21-23, the terminus ad quem of a centralization of *pesaḥ* is provided by the traditions in Lev. 23:5-8[101] and Ezk. 45:21a,23-24, which presuppose rather than implement the centralization of *pesaḥ*, and by a critical reference to the Priestly-exilic redaction of Dt. 16:1-7(8) in Ex. 12:1-14.

3. *Development of Priestly pesaḥ Programs in the Pentateuch and in the "Draft Constitution" of Ezekiel.* The redaction of the existing tradition of the family ritual in Ex. 12:1-14 (P^G[?][102]) stipulates the tenth day of the first month as the day of prepara-

97. Ibid., 344.

98. Concerning the historical question of a *pesaḥ* reform implemented by Josiah, see Rost, "Josias Passa," 87-93; Delcor, 205-19. Concerning the question of the prehistory of a Hezekian reform of the Feast of Unleavened Bread (2 Ch. 30:13,21-22), see Haag, "Mazzenfest des Hiskia," 216-25. Concerning a parallel medieval development toward a centralization of the Samaritan *pesaḥ* as a result of the reduction of the Samaritan area, see J. Jeremias, *Passahfeier der Samaritaner*, 66-72.

99. H.-D. Hoffmann, *Reform und Reformen. ATANT* 66 (1980), 259; H. Spieckermann, *Juda unter Assur in der Sargonidenzeit. FRLANT* 129 (1982), 130ff.

100. "Zur neueren Diskussion über 2 Kön 22–23," in Lohfink, ed., *Das Deuteronomium: Entstehung, Gestalt und Botschaft. BETL* 68 (1985), 45 n. 91 (with bibliog.).

101. Cholewiński, *Heiligkeitsgesetz*, 188-89, 214.

102. See J.-L. Ska, "Les plaies d'Égypte dans le récit sacerdotal (P^g)," *Bibl* 60 (1979) 23-25; P. Weimar, "Struktur und Komposition der priesterschriftlichen Geschichtsdarstellung," *BN* 24 (1984) 142 n. 159 (with bibliog.).

tion (12:3aβ,6a) corresponding to the Day of Atonement on the tenth day of the seventh month; in so doing, it introduces an allusion to the atonement theme that, with the association of *ntn* (12:7) with the atoning smearing of the horns of the altar (29:12,20, etc.),[103] also lends a new semantic horizon to the blood ritual. This allusion underscores the function of *pesaḥ* as a remembrance of the exodus night by inserting motifs associated with the pastoral ideal (12:11) and also integrates the theme of the Feast of Unleavened Bread (12:8b,14[15-20]) into the present *pesaḥ* tradition. Here the redaction stratum presupposes Dt. 16:1-7(8). Ex. 12:10 picks up on Dt. 16:4b, while Ex. 12:11abα *(beḥippāzôn)* picks up on Dt. 16:3b. Both passages include critical correctives: Ex. 12:8b,9 corrects the Dtn instruction to boil the sacrificial meat (Dt. 16:7a), while Ex. 12:5 corrects the Dtn instruction also to slaughter larger livestock (Dt. 16:2). Ex. 12:3(end) *(śeh labbāyiṯ)*,4 underscores the ritual's family focus and interprets the Dtn demand for centralization.

In addition to drawing from Dt. 16:1-7(8), Ex. 12:12-13 also picks up on Yahwistic traditions in Ex. 11–12. Ex. 12:13 picks up 12:23 and develops the understanding of the *pesaḥ* ritual by depersonalizing the *mašḥîṯ* from the perspective of Yahweh's exclusive status. During the exilic period, the plague theme acquired surprising contemporaneity under the aspect of Yahweh's mighty acts in history toward the nations (12:12) and made the *pesaḥ* blood into Israel's distinguishing feature among those nations (12:13); in a fashion transcending 12:21-23, that theme was now incorporated into the interpretation of the *pesaḥ* ritual itself. The correctives to the Dtn reform program derive from problems inhering in the overall conception of the P redaction, namely, that the *pesaḥ* ritual, because of its association with the exodus, is introduced *before* the establishment of the legitimate sanctuary. Hence 12:1-14 in its final form can be explained on the basis of its position within the narrative, which has undergone Priestly redaction. It is doubtful that 12:1-14 reflects a displacement of *pesaḥ* back into the family after the destruction of the temple. The *pesaḥ* legislation in Lev. 23:5-8 picks up (in Lev. 23:5) on Ex. 12:6 *(bên hā'arbāyim)* and presupposes the celebration of *pesaḥ* at the central sanctuary.[104]

Although Lev. 23:5-8 picks up on Dt. 16:1-7(8) and associates *pesaḥ* and the Feast of Unleavened Bread together in sequence, it transcends Dt. 16:1-7(8) in distinguishing them as two separate observances. The offering theme in Lev. 23:8a is a traditio-historical accretion that now separates the *miqrā' qōḏeš* stipulations in vv. 7,8b, and as a *w-qaṭal*-x statement it deviates syntactically from the existing sequence of nominal clause and x-*yiqṭōl* statements. The incorporation of v. 8a establishes a bridge to an exilic *pesaḥ* theory in Ezk. 45:21a,23-24 that was independent of Lev. 23:5-7,8b.

Ezk. 45:21a,23-24 makes *pesaḥ* into a festival *(happāsaḥ ḥag)* of the seven-day *'ôlâ* and *ḥaṭṭā'ṯ* centered at the temple and fixed for the fourteenth day of the first month. The addendum 45:21b reintroduces the classic ritual of the Feast of Unleav-

103. See Laaf, 112; differently, B. Janowski, *Sühne als Heilsgeschehen. WMANT* 55 (1982), 248-49.

104. Cholewiński, *Heiligkeitsgesetz*, 214-15.

ened Bread and establishes here too a bridge between Dt. 16:1-7(8) and postexilic *pesaḥ* praxis.

Later addenda (P^S) accommodate the Priestly-exilic *pesaḥ* tradition to the postexilic situation of the second temple by picking up on tendencies already present in the P redaction of Ex. 12:1-14. Ex. 12:15-20 and Nu. 28:16-25 (P^S) transcend Ex. 12:1-14 thematically in once again introducing the theme of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, also reducing thereby the distance from the Dtn reform program in Ex. 12:1-14.

R^P continues the tendency to reintegrate the Dtn reform program within the Priestly context by combining P and Dtr motifs.[105] Ex. 12:24-27a uses parallel structure with 13:3-16 to bracket the Feast of Unleavened Bread together with *pesaḥ*. Josh. (4:19;) 5:10-12 inserts the *pesaḥ* motif into a preexisting tradition associated with the Feast of Unleavened Bread[106] and portrays the Passover–Feast of Unleavened Bread as the centralized primary festival for celebrating entrance into the land (see Ezr. 6:19-21). In its final form, the book of Exodus is subdivided into seven sections; *pesaḥ* (Ex. 12:1-36) and sabbath (16:13-35) correspond chiastically[107] in providing a framework for the third of those seven sections, taking as their point of departure the seventh day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread as a day of rest (Dt. 16:8; Lev. 23:8b; Ex. 12:16; Nu. 28:25).

The sacrificial law in Nu. 28:16-25 broadly develops the atonement theme already raised in Ex. 12:1-14. The goal of *pesaḥ* in separating Israel out from among the nations (Ex. 12:12-13) as well as its newly acquired atoning function prompt the demand for cultic purity, for exclusion of the uncircumcised from *pesaḥ* (Ex. 12:[42],43-50; Josh. 5:2-9,10-12), and prompt the establishment of a second *pesaḥ* in the second month (Nu. 9:6-14; 2 Ch. 30:2-3,15).

4. *Development of the Late Israelite pesaḥ in the Mazzot Papyrus of Elephantine and in the Christian pesaḥ Traditions.* The pentateuchal process of reintegrating the Dtn reform program into P traditions emerges in parallel *pesaḥ* traditions in the Elephantine papyrus concerning the Feast of Unleavened Bread[108] and in the Chronistic *pesaḥ* traditions (Ezr. 6:19-22; 2 Ch. 30:1-27; 35:1-19). This papyrus[109] introduces a regulation for the Feast of Unleavened Bread related to Ex. 12:15-20 (Lev. 23:5-8; Nu. 28:16-25)[110] and thereby corrects a celebration corresponding to Ex. 12:1-14 that has been reduced to the *pesaḥ* night.[111]

---

105. See H.-J. Fabry, "Spuren des Pentateuchredaktors in Jos 4,21ff.," in Lohfink, ed., *Deuteronomium,* 354-55.

106. Otto, *Mazzotfest,* 62-63, 175-86; a different view is taken by M. Rose, *Deuteronomist und Jahwist. ATANT* 67 (1981), 24-45, who describes it as a military tradition that has been subjected to Dtr and Priestly redaction.

107. Weimar, *Meerwundererzählung,* 16-20.

108. *AP,* no. 21.

109. See the summary of the textual reconstructions and interpretations in Ros-Garmendia, 285-92 (with bibliog.).

110. See Grelot, *VT* 4 (1954) 367-68.

111. See also the mention of *psḥ'* in two Elephantine ostraca, E. L. Sukenik and J. Kutscher, "A Passover Ostracon from Elephantine," *Qedem* 1 (1942) 53-56.

The *pesaḥ* traditions from the Hellenistic period in 2 Ch. 30:1-27; 35:1-19; Ezr. 6:19-22 quite blatantly integrate the Dtn reform program into the *pesaḥ* program developed within the P stratum of the Pentateuch. The oxen required by Dt. 16:2 are interpreted as *zeḇaḥ šᵉlāmîm* (2 Ch. 35:12ff.; see in v. 13 the attempt to mediate between the Dtn inclination and P in the formulation *wayᵉḇaššᵉlû happesaḥ bā'ēš*). The reintegration of the theme of the Feast of Unleavened Bread can be seen in its status as an appendix to the *pesaḥ* tradition in 2 Ch. 35:17b; Ezr. 6:22. In 2 Ch. 30:1-27[112] the fusion of the Feast of Unleavened Bread (2 Ch. 30:13,21-22) and *pesaḥ* (2 Ch. 30:15,17-18[113]) has progressed even further. In the motif regarding how the centralization of the *pesaḥ* slaughter in Jerusalem had not become universally established (2 Ch. 30:10-11; 35:18; Ezr. 6:21), the Chronistic *pesaḥ* traditions betray the presence of a separate Samaritan development.[114] These passages transcend the Dtn and P *pesaḥ* programs by fixing the functions of the priests and Levites in connection with the blood sprinkling, the burnt offering, and the slaughtering of the *pesaḥ* animals (2 Ch. 30:15-17;[115] 35:2-6,10-15; Ezr. 6:20). The Dtn "memorial to suffering" (Braulik) changes in the reflection of the Chronistic traditions into a festival of joy (2 Ch. 30:21,23; Ezr. 6:22; cf. Mish. *Pesaḥ.* 10:5; Jub. 49:2,22).

5. *Late Israelite and Early Jewish pesaḥ in Mishnah and Targum.* The Chronistic *pesaḥ* program was unable to implement some of its most important features in the second temple. Israelite men rather than Levites carried out the slaughter of the *pesaḥ* in the temple's forecourt of the priests in three sections (Mish. *Zebaḥ.* 5:8; Tos. *Pesaḥ.* 4:12; 162:20; Mish. *Pesaḥ.* 5:5; *Šabb.* 1:11; Philo *Vict.* 5; Josephus *Ant.* 3.9.1 §§225-27). The priests, arranged in two rows, caught the blood with golden and silver cups and passed it on to the altar, where it was sprinkled on the altar base rather than on the altar horns.[116] The Levites' task was limited to overseeing the purity of temple visitors (Philo *Spec. Leg.* 1.156) and the Hallel singing (Tos. *Pesaḥ.* 3:11; cf. 2 Ch. 35:15). Tannaitic tradition (Jer. *Pesaḥ.* 6:33c; Bab. *Pesaḥ.* 70a) shows that the *zeḇaḥ šᵉlāmîm* (2 Ch. 35:15) could only be preserved as a voluntary sacrifice.

The destruction of the temple brought the *pesaḥ* slaughter to an end (Mish. *Pesaḥ.* 10:3) since the demand of Dt. 16:2,6-7 to slaughter the *pesaḥ* only at the place chosen by Yahweh could no longer be fulfilled. Attempts in the Diaspora to maintain the consumption of whole roasted lambs during the *pesaḥ* night were unsuccessful (Tos. *Yom Ṭob* 2:15; 204:24 par.; see also Augustine *Retractat* 1.10).[117]

---

112. Concerning the literary strata, see Haag, "Mazzenfest des Hiskia," 216ff.

113. See Wambacq, *Bibl* 57 (1976) 219-20.

114. J. Jeremias, *Passahfeier der Samaritaner,* 67.

115. See in this regard Janowski, *Sühne als Heilsgeschehen,* 249.

116. Concerning the question of atonement, see Morris, 65-66; A. Schenker, "Das Zeichen des Blutes und die Gewissheit der Vergebung im AT," *Münchener theologische Zeitschrift* 34 (1983) 195-213; N. Füglister, "Sühne durch Blut — zur Bedeutung von Leviticus 17,11," *Studien zum Pentateuch. FS W. Kornfeld* (Vienna, 1977), 143-65.

117. Concerning the *pesaḥ* slaughter of the Falasha (Ethiopian Jews) and Samaritans, see J. Jeremias, *Passahfeier der Samaritaner,* 59 (with bibliog.).

The joyous character of the *pesaḥ* already evident in the Chronistic program is underscored by the flute accompaniment to the Hallel singing (Mish. *'Arak.* 2:3). The ensuing roasting and eating of the *pesaḥ* took place throughout the entire city of Jerusalem (Mish. *Pesaḥ.* 7:12; 10:3; *Šabb.* 1:11; a different view is taken by Jub. 49:16,20). Hence every house acquired something of the temple's own holiness (Philo *Spec. Leg.* 2.148). Because of the rapid increase in the number of festival pilgrims and in the population of Jerusalem itself during the Hasmonean period,[118] this part of the *pesaḥ* festival was probably decentralized during the 1st century B.C.E. and shifted to the families or to familylike (masters and pupils; neighbors) or ad hoc table fellowships (*ḥ^{a}ḇûrâ;* Josephus: *phratría;* Mish. *Pesaḥ.* 8:3; Tos. *Pesaḥ.* 8:3; Mk. 14:12; Mt. 26:18; Lk. 22:8).

The meal is characterized by the four cups of wine, recitation of the Hallel, and remembrance of the exodus out of Egypt (Mish. *Pesaḥ.* 10). The gesture of solidarity with the wandering Israelites required by Ex. 12:11 and the blood ritual (Ex. 12:7,13) were considered to be part of the Egyptian *pesaḥ* and were thus not maintained (Mish. *Pesaḥ.* 9:5; Tos. *Pesaḥ.* 8:11ff.). Instead, a Greco-Roman banquet[119] becomes the focus, and even the poor participate (Mish. *Pesaḥ.* 10:1; cf. Mk. 14:18; Lk. 22:14; Jn. 13:12), a proleptic actualization of eschatological hope for liberation that acquires a strong social component as the liberation of the poor from poverty. The *pesaḥ* haggadah continues this feature in the father's Aramaic invitation to all the poor and hungry: *kol diṣ^{e}rîḵ yêṯê w^{e}yipsaḥ,* "all in need come and celebrate Passover." During the 1st century B.C.E., the messianic-eschatological mood of Passover became increasingly visible, expressing itself in the Hallel singing, especially in the double recitation of Ps. 118:25-26 *(bārûḵ habbā' b^{e}šēm yhwh).*

After the destruction of the temple by Titus, a petition for a reconstruction of the city formulated by Rabbi Aqiba was added to the *pesaḥ* ritual.[120] Yet even if in the structuring of the meal the portrayal of eschatological expectation seemed to replace that of the exodus situation, remembrance *(zikkārôn)* of the exodus liberation by no means lost its central significance. Rather, past experience and future expectation together became part of the present festival fullness. Just as the anticipated future proleptically already became present, so also did the past become present again in remembrance. All who participated in *pesaḥ* were charged with viewing themselves as if they too had been led out of Egypt, "from sorrow to gladness, and from mourning to a festival day, and from darkness to great light, and from servitude to redemption" (Mish. *Pesaḥ.* 10:5). Fathers came to employ the pedagogical elements of mediation and internalization in instructing their children so that everyone might be able to identify with the exodus generation in this way (e.g., Mish. *Pesaḥ.* 10:4; see already Ex. 12:26,27a; 13:8-16).

On the second day of the festival week, the omer sheaves (Lev. 23:9-14) from Jerusalem's surroundings (Tos. *Menaḥ.* 10:21: *biq'aṯ bêṯ miqlâ* in the Kidron Valley[121]) or,

---

118. E. Otto, *Jerusalem, die Geschichte der Heiligen Stadt* (Stuttgart, 1980), 119-26.

119. Beer, *Pesachim (Ostern),* 188-89.

120. Schlesinger and Güns, 32.

121. See in this regard G. Dalman, *Jerusalem und sein Gelände* (1930; repr. Hildesheim, 1972), 160.

if the barley was not yet ripe in this area, from more distant locales (Mish. *Menaḥ.* 10:2) were offered at the temple.

The offering of the sheaves accentuates once again the fertility theme that was already a constitutive part of the Feast of Unleavened Bread but was then preempted by *pesaḥ* in the Dtn, P, and Chronistic programs; this theme is also part of the *bᵉrāḵâ* spoken over the *karpos* ("King of the Universe, who creates the fruits of the earth") as well as in the *bᵉrāḵôṯ* over the unleavened bread ("King of the Universe, who brings forth bread from the earth"). The postexilic Feast of Weeks attests a parallel inclination to reintegrate the fertility theme.[122]

The targumic tradition places remembrance of the exodus into a universal horizon extending from creation to Israel's eschatological deliverance. The oldest version of the Passover midrash, Tg. Ps.-J. Ex. 12:42 ("Poem of the Four Nights"),[123] associates *lêl šimmurîm* ("Night of Waking")[124] with a remembrance of the nights of creation, of God's appearance before Abraham, in Egypt when his hand slew the firstborn of the Egyptians and rescued the firstborn of Israel, and of the deliverance of the house of Israel from bondage to the nations. The Fragment Targum and Codex Neofiti[125] expand this tradition by introducing biblical allusions. Special theological interest becomes evident in the expansions of the second and fourth nights, and a messianic Moses typology provides the vehicle for portraying an eschatological wandering out of the wilderness during the night of liberation. The portrayal of the second night has been subjected to multiple redactions. A first expansion incorporated the promises to the sons from Gen. 15 and 17. A second added the motif of the sacrifice of Isaac from Gen. 22. The central focus is Isaac's own heavenly vision. No explicit connection is made between the atoning blood of the sacrifice of Isaac and the *pesaḥ* blood, so Tg. Ex. 12:42 cannot be associated with the Aqedah *(ʿᵃqēḏâ).*

The association of the sacrifice of Isaac and *pesaḥ* was anticipated in Jub. 17:15 with the explicit dating of the sacrifice of Isaac to the 15th of Nisan.[126] Here too no reference to the connection between *pesaḥ* and Aqedah motifs is discernible. The rescue of the firstborn son by an animal sacrifice is typologically related to the rescue of the Israelite firstborn by the *pesaḥ.*[127] Although the Aqedah is developed in the Frag. Tg. and in Tg. Neof. to Gen. 22:8,10, these texts do not associate it with *pesaḥ.* The earliest reliably dated association of the Aqedah and *pesaḥ* dates to the Tannaitic period (Mek. Y. Ex. 12:13)[128] and was probably already a reaction to a Christian typology of Isaac-

---

122. Otto, *TRE,* XI, 101 (with bibliog.).

123. See Davies, *JJS* 30 (1979) 65; a different view is taken by Vermes, 217 n. 2, who suggests that Tg. Ps.-J. Ex. 12:42 is an abbreviated version of Frag. Tg. Ex. 12:42.

124. See Le Déaut, *Nuit Pascale,* 272-73.

125. See ibid., 133-35, 215, 264-65.

126. See G. L. Davenport, *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees. StPB* 20 (1971), 59 nn. 2 and 3.

127. See Davies, "Sacrifice of Isaac and Passover," 129-30.

128. Concerning the dating, see E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (Philadelphia, 1977), 65-69 (with bibliog.).

Christ (Barn. 7:3; Melito of Sardis *Frag.* 9; 10;[129] Irenaeus *Haer.* 4.5.4; Tertullian *Adv. Marc.* 3.18; *Adv. Jud.* 10).

Tg. Ps.-J. Ex. 12:13 associates the blood of the *pesaḥ* with circumcision. It is not the *pesaḥ* ritual alone that effects protection, but rather the merit of circumcision (cf. Mek. Ex. 12:13). Tg. Cant. 2:9 has the Israelites smear their doors with *pesaḥ* blood and with the blood of circumcision.[130] Mek. Ex. 12:6 (R. Mattithia ben Ḥeresh) associates the blood of *pesaḥ* and circumcision together in an atoning function (see also Ex. Rab. 15:35b,26a).[131] The targumic tradition to Zec. 9:11 ("because of the blood of your *b^e^rîṯ* I will set your prisoners free from the waterless pit") evokes the deliverance aspect of *pesaḥ* by referring *b^e^ḏam b^e^rîṯêḵ* to the *pesaḥ* blood.

6. *pesaḥ in Jubilees, the Qumran Festival Calendar, and the Temple Scroll.* The literary addendum to the book of Jubilees contains a *pesaḥ* tradition in Jub. 49 deviating in several key features from the *pesaḥ* praxis that developed from the late Israelite period to the destruction of the temple. The Egyptian *pesaḥ* (49:1-6) that came to be distinguished from *pesaḥ* after the establishment of the cult (49:18-19) accommodates Ex. 12 to an altered *pesaḥ* praxis. The motif of wearing clothes for a journey is passed over, and instead of bitter herbs and matzo, it is wine as the "beginning of joy" (Jub. 49:2) that accompanies the *pesaḥ* meal (49:6). The stipulations for the *pesaḥ* after the exodus and after the establishment of the sanctuary require that the *pesaḥ* meal be roasted and consumed in the courtyard of the sanctuary (49:16,18-21). Every male Israelite twenty years and older (49:17), to the extent he is pure (49:9), is to keep *pesaḥ* (49:10). The temporal sequence for *pesaḥ* that remains somewhat vague in Dt. 16:6-7 and Ex. 12:6 is fixed more precisely ("from the third part of the day to the third part of the night," Jub. 49:10-11; Mish. *Pesaḥ.* 5:1: "the daily evening offering is slaughtered at a half after the eighth hour . . . and after this, the *pesaḥ*"; Josephus *B.J.* 6.9.3 §423: between the ninth and eleventh hour; Mek. Y. Ex. 12:6: at the sixth hour). Even though participation in *pesaḥ* is bound by the demand for purity, no reference is made to a second *pesaḥ*.

A *mišmārôṯ* ordinance from Qumran Cave 4 associates the festival regulations in Lev. 23 and Nu. 9:1-13 with the pure solar calendar of three hundred sixty-four days.[132] The Passover meal on the evening of the fourteenth day of the first month always falls on a Tuesday, and the first festival day on the fifteenth of the first month always on a Wednesday.[133] The calendar avoids the coincidence of *pesaḥ* and the sabbath and the resulting conflicts between festival regulations and sabbath regulations (cf.

---

129. See D. Lerch, *Isaaks Opferung christlich gedeutet. BHT* 12 (1950), 27-46.

130. See Ohana, 385-99.

131. Morris, 65-66.

132. J. T. Milik, "Le travail d'édition des mss. du désert de Juda," *Congress Volume, Strasbourg 1956. SVT* 4 (1957), 24-25; E. Vogt, "Kalenderfragmente aus Qumran," *Bibl* 39 (1958) 72-77; concerning dating, see R. de Vaux, "Chronique archéologique: Khirbet Qumrân," *RB* 63 (1956) 73-74.

133. J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. SBLSBS* 8 (1975), 131-37 (with bibliog.).

Mish. *Pesaḥ.* 5:8-10; 6:1).[134] The strict observance of sabbath considerations in Qumran (CD 11:17: *'al ya'al 'îš lammizbēaḥ baššabbāṯ;* cf. Jub. 50:10-11) took priority over other festival observances.[135] The sheave offering is fixed on the first Sunday after the *pesaḥ* week, i.e., on the twenty-sixth of the first month. The second *pesaḥ* was to take place thirty days after the first.

11QT 17:7-16 agrees with Jub. 49 in deviating from mishnaic traditions. In contrast to late Israelite praxis prior to the destruction of the temple, the *pesaḥ* meal is to be taken in the courtyards of the sanctuary (11QT 17:9; Jub. 49:16-20), and the age stipulation of twenty years (11QT 17:8) corresponds to Jub. 49:17; 1QSa 1:8-11.[136] The regulations for the Feast of Unleavened Bread in 11QT 17:10-16 follow Lev. 23:6-8; Nu. 28:17-25; Jub. 49:22-23.

Otto

---

134. Concerning the discussion of the priority of *pesaḥ* in Hillel the Elder, see Tos. *Pesaḥ.* 4:1; Jer. *Pesaḥ.* 6:33a; Bab. *Pesaḥ.* 66a.

135. J. M. Baumgarten, *Studies in Qumran Law. SJLA* 24 (1977), 101-14.

136. See in this regard P. Borgen, "'At the age of twenty' in 1QSa," *RevQ* 3 (1961) 267-77.

פִּסֵּחַ *pissēaḥ*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology and Meaning; 2. Usage and Synonyms. II. 1. Lame Persons in the OT; 2. *pissēaḥ* in Personal Names; 3. Lame Animals; 4. LXX and Qumran.

---

pissēaḥ. G. Bressan, "L'espugnazione di Sion in 2 Sam 5,6-8//1 Cron 11,4-6 e il problema del '*ṣinnôr*,'" *Bibl* 25 (1944) 346-81; G. Brunet, "Les aveugles et boiteux jébusites," in J. A. Emerton, ed., *Studies in the Historical Books of the OT. SVT* 30 (1979), 65-72; R. A. Carlson, *David the Chosen King: A Traditio-Historical Approach to the Second Book of Samuel* (Uppsala, 1964); B. Couroyer, "L'origine égyptienne du mot 'Pâque,'" *RB* 62 (1955) 481-96; M. Douglas, *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* (London, 1966); G. Fohrer, *Elia. ATANT* 53 (²1968); T. F. Glasson, "The 'Passover,' a Misnomer: The Meaning of the Verb *Pasach*," *JTS* 10 (1959) 79-84; J. J. Glück, "The Conquest of Jerusalem in the Account of 2 Sam 5,6a-8 with Special Reference to 'the Blind and the Lame' and the Phrase *wᵉyigga' baṣṣinnor*," *Studies in the Book of Samuel. OTWSA* 3 (1960), 98-105; J. H. Grønbæk, *Die Geschichte vom Aufstieg Davids. 1 Sam 15–2 Sam 5: Tradition und Komposition. AcThD* 10 (1971); D. M. Gunn, *The Story of King David: Genre and Interpretation. JSOTSup* 6 (1978); H. Haag, *Vom alten zum neuen Pascha. SBS* 49 (1971); J. Heller, "David und die Krüppel (2 Sam 5,6-8)," *CV* 8 (1965) 251-58; W. H. Irwin, *Isaiah 28–33. BietOr* 30 (1977); O. Keel, "Erwägungen zum Sitz im Leben des vormosaischen Pascha und zur Etymology von פֶּסַח," *ZAW* 84

I. 1. *Etymology and Meaning.* The adj. *pissēaḥ* derives from an intensive form of the verb *pāsaḥ* describing the condition of a person or animal who is unable to walk or run normally and who as a result cannot move forward in an unrestricted manner. In the niphal the verb means "to become lame" (2 S. 4:4) and describes an unfortunate situation. The intensive form *qiṭṭēl* refers to an unchanging or relatively unchanging condition.[1] Concerning the related Akk. *pessû* → פסח *pāsaḥ*. Despite the consistent meaning of *pissēaḥ* and its unmistakable relationship with *pāsaḥ*, the exact meaning of the verb is not clear.

R. Schmitt suspects a relationship with Arab. *fasaḫa*, "to dislocate, dissolve,"[2] in which case the adjective would then refer to a useless limb.[3] The *ḫ*, however, prevents this theory from fitting Akk. *pessû*. By contrast, G. Gerleman suggests the basic meaning "strike, ricochet against something,"[4] so that the extended meaning would then refer to a destroyed or broken limb.[5]

The verb *pāsaḥ* in the OT is generally associated with *pesaḥ* and taken to mean "jump, hop" (see Ex. 12:13,23,27). We cannot determine here whether there was yet another root meaning "protect, rescue."[6]

The main problem with understanding the precise meaning of *pissēaḥ* derives from the obvious uncertainty between "to be lame, etc." and "to hop, etc." The one addresses a severe restriction of movement, the other an intensification of movement.

One key passage in understanding the two meanings is 1 K. 18:26, which uses *psḥ* piel to describe the ritual activity of the Ba'al prophets at *('al)* the altar on Carmel, a passage closely related to 1 K. 18:21, where Elijah accuses the people of wavering (qal ptcp.) toward *('al)* two sides. Fohrer rejects any direct semantic relationship.[7] V. 26 allegedly portrays the prophets of Ba'al jumping wildly around in a ritual dance designed to induce ecstasy, while v. 21 uses metaphor to mean "to be lame, waver."[8] Although it seems obvious enough that the author was using wordplay, it is unclear whether he also understood this wordplay as a contrasting portrayal. The meaning "jump around" could fit both passages equally well, and one cannot exclude the possibility that the rit-

---

(1972) 414-34; P. Laaf, *Die Pascha-Feier Israels. BBB* 36 (1970), esp. 142-47; W. O. E. Oesterley, *The Sacred Dance: A Study in Comparative Folklore* (Cambridge, 1923); L. Rost, *Die Überlieferung von der Thronnachfolge Davids. BWANT* III/6 (1926) = *Das kleine Credo und andere Studien zum AT* (Heidelberg, 1965), 119-253; H. J. Stoebe, "Die Einnahme Jerusalems und der Ṣinnor," *ZDPV* 73 (1957) 73-99; M. Tsevat, "'Ishboshet and Congeners," *HUCA* 44 (1976) 71-87; E. C. Ulrich Jr., *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus. HSM* 19 (1978), esp. 128ff.; W. G. E. Watson, "David Ousts the City Rulers of Jebus," *VT* 20 (1970) 501-2; Y. Yadin, *The Art of Warfare in Biblical Lands*, 2 vols. (New York, 1963), esp. II, 267-70.

1. See *BLe*, 477b.
2. Wehr, 712.
3. *Exodus und Passah, ihr Zusammenhang im AT. OBO* 7 (1975), 25-26.
4. "Was heisst פָּסַח," *ZAW* 88 (1976) 409-13.
5. See also Keel, 430ff.; Irwin, 114.
6. See Glasson, 79ff.; cf. J. P. Hyatt, *Exodus. NCBC* (1971), 133; Irwin, 114.
7. *Elia*, 14.
8. See S. J. de Vries, *1 Kings. WBC* 12 (1985), 229.

ual activity in v. 26 might also have consisted of such movement.[9] Although this explanation seems to be the least likely, the ambiguity cannot be overlooked. For the word *pissēaḥ* itself, this ambiguity means that the root *pāsaḥ* developed an intensive form meaning "jump over" and then a privative *qiṭṭēl* meaning "lame, crippled."[10]

2. *Usage and Synonyms.* The closest synonym for *pissēaḥ* is *nᵉḵēh raglayim,* "with two broken legs," "crippled in both legs" (2 S. 4:4). Lev. 21:18-19 envisions both possibilities. The adj. *pissēaḥ* apparently describes both someone in a chronic condition of lameness as well as someone whose movement is temporarily restricted by a broken leg. The OT does not distinguish concerning the causes of such a condition. Moreover, restrictions in the use of arms are not described with *pissēaḥ.* The scope of a *pissēaḥ* could extend from a relatively minor restriction of movement to almost complete immobility. Mic. 4:6-7 uses the verb *ṣālaʿ* II for "to limp, be lame" (cf. Gen. 32:32[Eng. 31]).

The adj. *pissēaḥ* is often associated with the blind (→ עור *ʿiwwēr;* Lev. 21:18; Dt. 15:21; 2 S. 5:6,8; Jer. 31:8). The lame and blind represented the most serious forms of physical handicaps. Not surprisingly, customary military atrocities included the laming of animals (see 2 S. 8:4) and the blinding of prisoners of war (1 S. 11:2; 2 K. 25:7). Both the blind and the lame were considered to be cultically impure.

II. 1. *Lame Persons in the OT.* The first reference to persons classified as *pissēaḥ* appears in a collection of regulations for the qualification for priestly service (Lev. 21:18). This verse occurs in a section (vv. 16-23) generally understood as a later insertion into H, itself already a late composition.[11] The word occurs in connection with blindness as a handicap disqualifying a person from priestly service.[12] A lame person was not considered to be whole (→ שלם *šālēm*), a condition understood as a kind of impurity preventing the person from entering the sanctuary. Hence declaring a person to be "lame" not only disqualified the person liturgically, but also passed an ethical-moral judgment on the person (see Job 29:15). We can only vaguely imagine the extent to which lame persons were treated separately in legal and similar proceedings. They probably constituted such a small group that no special measures were developed to deal with their specific problems.

The criterion of physical intactness becomes an issue for the first time in Israel's history in the figure of Merib-baal (Mephibosheth), Jonathan's son and thus Saul's grandson (2 S. 4:4; 9:1-13; 19:24-30; 21:1-14). David grants him the right to an adequate pension (2 S. 9:10-13) and ultimately even the possibility of taking over Saul's estate, though David's purpose, certainly, was to keep Saul's grandson under his control.[13] Merib-baal was lame, but it was not appropriate simply to exclude him from suc-

9. See G. Hölscher, *Die Propheten* (1914), 132.
10. See *HP,* 140; Haag, 25ff.; E. Würthwein, *Die Bücher der Könige. ATD* XI/2 (1984), 217.
11. See K. Elliger, *Leviticus. HAT* I/4 (1966), 284.
12. See Douglas, 51.
13. See P. Kyle McCarter, *2 Samuel. AB* 9 (1984), 265.

cession to the throne (things were different, of course, with regard to the priesthood; see Lev. 21:18). At this point, however, we encounter the literary problems attaching to the story of David's accession.[14] The reference to how Merib-baal became lame might be behind 2 S. 9:3.[15] In any event the positioning of Jonathan's son before Saul's son Ishbaal (2 S. 4) was a conscious literary device. The detailed description of the circumstances surrounding Merib-baal's lameness is designed to free David from the suspicion of wanting to exclude the pretender to the throne.

Lameness is also an important element in the portrayal of how David conquered the Jebusite fortress Jerusalem (2 S. 5:6-10). The narrative mentions lame and blind persons three times (vv. 6,8) and confronts the historian with considerable problems.[16] Although the Qumran fragments 4QSam[a] do help with textual reconstruction, ultimately they too are unable to solve these problems.[17]

Determining the identity of the *pisᵉḥîm* (vv. 6,8) requires that one first understand the secondary character of the parenthetical remark in v. 8b: "the blind and the lame shall not come into the house," a remark closely associated with the exclusion of such persons from priestly service (Lev. 21:18). The insertion of this remark betrays the presence of a scribe who no longer knew the real reason for David's hatred of the lame and the blind (v. 8a). The identity of the *pisᵉḥîm* and of the *ʿiwᵉrîm* is unclear, and the text itself is difficult (pl. subj., sg. verb, possible only if one understands the subject as a collective; Wellhausen's emendation of the verb as pl. *yᵉsîruḵā* has been largely accepted). In that case, the sentence might contain a mocking remark about the Jebusite inhabitants (*yôšēḇ*, not "ruler" [Watson]).

By contrast, Stoebe suggests that this mention of the lame and the blind alludes to David's own soldiers in view of the well-fortified city. This view, however, founders on the equally difficult reference to David's hatred (v. 8a).

4QSam[a], with *hsyt* (< *syt*, "drive along, forward"), helps us to understand the LXX and implies that the reference here is to the confident behavior of the Jebusite defenders. Although Jebusite arrogance might explain David's hatred, it does not clarify the role of the blind and the lame. Similarly, although early scholars tried to understand this hatred as the mutual hatred between military adversaries, the text itself offers no reason to do so. The Targums paraphrase in interpreting them as "sinners and guilty ones."[18] Medieval Jewish commentators understood the reference as being to two idols.[19]

Wellhausen and others understood v. 8a as a cloaked reference to the fact that David allowed no survivors in his campaign against the Jebusites. David hated the blind and the lame because they had spurred the inhabitants of the Jebusite fortress to make fun of David and his soldiers.

---

14. See Grønbæk.
15. See Carlson, 51-52; McCarter, *2 Samuel*, 128.
16. See S. R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel* (Oxford, ²1913), 258-61; Stoebe, 73-99; Bressan, 346-81; Brunet, 65-72, et al.
17. See Ulrich, 128-29.
18. Driver, *Samuel*, 261.
19. McCarter, *2 Samuel*, 138.

The prophets refer to the lame in three passages, all of whose contexts are eschatologically colored. Isa. 33:23 speaks of the great eschatological homecoming to Zion and about God's *kāḇôḏ*, which from then on would remain in Jerusalem (33:17-24).[20] The text is probably corrupt, and *BHS* reads *'iwwēr* in v. 23c.[21] The text, "then the blind will divide spoil in abundance, the lame will fall to plundering," contains an unmistakable allusion to 2 S. 5:6ff.,[22] if one accepts the emendation following the Targums. Then, however, allusions to Isa. 9:2(3) emerge showing that the theme "lameness and blindness" derives from the original prophetic warning (6:10). That warning was then reworked like a midrash under the influence of 2 S. 5:6ff., and Isa. 35:6 picks up the same theme yet again: "Then the lame shall leap like a deer, and the tongue of the speechless sing for joy." The preceding verse (v. 5) also emphasizes that in the coming eschatological age the eyes of the blind will also be opened. These statements are embedded in the section 34:1–35:7, which J. Vermeylen identifies as an eschatological vision with apocalyptic features.[23] By contrast, O. H. Steck views Isa. 35 as a redactional unity designed to facilitate the incorporation of Isa. 40ff. into the collection of earlier Isaianic prophetic sayings.[24] In this context vv. 5 and 7 are secondary. The text attests subsequent developments of earlier themes, including the notion that the lame will regain their mobility. In the new Jerusalem, just as at the time when the Jebusite fortress was conquered, the blind and the lame will themselves be conquered by being healed.

According to Jer. 31:8, part of a short expansion (vv. 7-9) within Jer. 31:2-8, itself similarly concerned with the inbreaking of the eschatological age, the lame and the blind will return home in a new exodus. Unlike Isa. 35:6, however, this passage does not say that the lame and the blind will be healed, an omission possibly suggesting that Jer. 31 was composed earlier than Isa. 35, during a period when the healing of the lame was not yet understood as a sign of Israel's eschatological renewal. The passage is also textually unclear (see LXX, which refers to Passover). Finally, Mic. 4:6-7 also mentions the homecoming of the lame (cf. the terminological similarity with Gen. 32:32[31]).

The OT wisdom writings mention the lame twice. According to Prov. 26:7 (concerning textual problems, see *BHS*), the proverb of a fool is like the limp leg of a lame person. In an extensive defense, Job tries to prove his integrity by referring especially to his behavior toward the needy. According to Job 29:15, he was "eyes to the blind, and feet to the lame." He emphasizes his innocence over against the accusations of his friends, and his words seem to reflect a familiar and traditional manner of expression.

---

20. See J. Vermeylen, *Du prophète Isaïe à l'apocalyptique, I. ÉBib* (1977), 433-34.
21. See Irwin, 161.
22. See Vermeylen, *Du prophète Isaïe,* I, 433.
23. Ibid., 440-45.
24. *Bereitete Heimkehr: Jesaja 35 als redaktionelle Brücke zwischen dem Ersten und dem Zweiten Jesaja. SBS* 121 (1985), 31-32.

2. *pissēaḥ in Personal Names.* Three people in the OT bear the name *pāsēaḥ,* "lame one, limper" (NRSV: Paseah; → פסח *pāsaḥ*).[25]

3. *Lame Animals.* Three OT passages qualify animals as *pissēaḥ* (Dt. 15:21; Mal. 1:8,13). Dt. 15:21 provides the basis for a comprehensive cultic regulation affecting which animals may be offered as sacrifices. No firstling male may be offered to God if it is blind or lame. This stipulation is then itself expanded such that any defect prevents an animal from being offered. This notion, one underlying Lev. 21:18 as well, understands physical handicaps as rendering a creature less than whole and thus ipso facto to be excluded from the cultic sphere. In Mal. 1:8 and 13 the prophet accuses his contemporaries of having violated this stipulation. One noteworthy point is that the Dtn stipulation in 15:22 is qualified such that the congregation is permitted to eat such animals, and we are thus surprised to find that such a stipulation could be ignored during the time of Malachi when the Dtn regulation did allow the use of such animals as secular food. The best animals may have been reserved for husbandry while only those with defects were offered as sacrifices. There may also have been considerable room for interpretation regarding just what constituted an intact sacrificial animal in the first place. In any event the Dtn stipulation itself and the prophetic reproach allow us to see how seriously any sort of physical defect was viewed as inimical to holiness. Whereas today physical handicaps are often considered particularly worthy of divine sympathy, the OT rigorously disqualified them as not belonging to the divine sphere at all.

4. *LXX and Qumran.* The LXX translates *pissēaḥ* consistently as *chōlós.* 1QM 7:4 suggests that in Qumran the *pissēaḥ* (alongside the *ḥiggēr,* "lame"[26]) was excluded from participating in the decisive eschatological battle of the "sons of light." P. R. Davies finds no connection with the regulation concerning the cultic acceptability of priests (Lev. 21:17-21), though considering the cultic dimension of the eschatological camp one can justifiably doubt this assertion.[27] 1QSa 2:6 is semantically interesting in that it uses *pissēaḥ* to refer only to hands, probably to some sort of wound or injury; in any event such a person is to be excluded from the community. 11QT 52:10 picks up the sacrificial regulation from Dt. 15:21.

Clements

25. For that translation see *IPN,* 227.
26. → חגר *ḥāgar (chāghar),* IV, 213.
27. *IQM, the War Scroll from Qumran: Its Structure and History. BietOr* 32 (1977), 42.

פסל psl; פָּסִיל* pāsîl; פֶּסֶל pesel

Contents: I. Occurrences: 1. OT Occurrences, Use, and Meaning; 2. Extrabiblical Occurrences and Etymology; 3. LXX. II. Central Themes in the OT: 1. Prohibition of Images; 2. Foreign Religions; 3. Polemic against Divine Images. III. Qumran.

---

psl. K.-H. Bernhardt, *Gott und Bild: Ein Beitrag zur Begründung und Deutung des Bilderverbotes im AT. ThArb* 2 (1956); idem, "Das 'Bilderverbot' im AT und im antiken Judentum," in J. Irmscher, ed., *Der byzantinische Bilderstreit* (Leipzig, 1980), 73-82; H.-U. Boesche, "Die Polemik gegen die Verehrung anderer Gottheiten neben Jahwe im alten Israel" (diss., Göttingen, 1962); R. P. Carroll, "The Aniconic God and the Cult of Images," *ST* 31 (1977) 51-64; E. M. Curtis, "The Theological Basis for the Prohibition of Images in the OT," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 28 (1985) 277-88; C. Dohmen, *Das Bilderverbot: Seine Entstehung und seine Entwicklung im AT. BBB* 62 ([2]1987); idem, "פָּסִיל* — פֶּסֶל: Zwei Nominalbildungen von פסל?" *BN* 16 (1981) 11-12; J. Dus, "Das zweite Gebot," *CV* 4 (1961) 37-50; H. Eising, "Der Weisheitslehrer und die Götterbilder," *Bibl* 40 (1959) 393-408; O. Eissfeldt, "Gott und Götzen im AT," *KlSchr,* I (1962), 266-73; J. A. Emerton, "New Light on Israelite Religion: The Implications of the Inscriptions from Kuntillet 'Ajrud," *ZAW* 94 (1982) 2-20; J. P. Floss, *Jahwe dienen — Göttern dienen: Terminologische, literarische und semantische Untersuchung einer theologischen Aussage zum Gottesverhältnis im AT. BBB* 45 (1975); K. Galling, "Götterbild, weibliches," *BRL*[2], 111-19; A. Graupner, "Zum Verhältnis der beiden Dekalogfassungen Ex 20 und Dtn 5," *ZAW* 99 (1987) 308-29; A. H. J. Gunneweg, "Bildlosigkeit Gottes im alten Israel," *Henoch* 6 (1984) 257-71; J. Gutmann, "The 'Second Commandment' and the Image in Judaism," *HUCA* 32 (1961) 161-74; idem, "Deuteronomy: Religious Reformation or Iconoclastic Revolution?" in idem, ed., *The Image and the Word: Confrontations in Judaism, Christianity and Islam* (Missoula, Mont., 1977), 5-25; H. Haag, "Das Bild als Gefahr für den Glauben," in H. Brunner, et al., eds., *Wort und Bild* (Munich, 1979), 151-65; J. Hahn, *Das "Goldene Kalb": Die Jahwe-Verehrung bei Stierbildern in der Geschichte Israels. EH* XXIII/154 (1981); F.-L. Hossfeld, *Der Dekalog: Seine späten Fassungen, die originale Komposition und seine Vorstufen. OBO* 45 (1982); O. Keel, *Jahwe-Visionen und Siegelkunst: Eine neue Deutung der Majestätsschilderungen in Jes 6, Ez 1 und 10 und Sach 4. SBS* 84/85 (1977); J. C. Kim, "Das Verhältnis Jahwes zu den anderen Göttern in Deuterojesaja" (diss., Heidelberg, 1963); D. Knapp, *Deuteronomium 4: Literarische Analyse und theologische Interpretation. GTA* 35 (1987); C. Konikoff, *The Second Commandment and Its Interpretation in the Art of Ancient Israel* (Geneva, 1973); A. Kruyswijk, *"Geen Gesneden Beeld . . ."* (Franeker, 1962); T. N. D. Mettinger, "The Veto on Images and the Aniconic God in Ancient Israel," in H. Biezais, ed., *Religious Symbols and Their Functions* (Uppsala, 1979), 15-29; D. Metzler, "Bilderstürme und Bilderfeindlichkeit in der Antike," in M. Warnke, ed., *Bildersturm: Die Zerstörung der Kunstwerke* (Munich, 1973), 14-29; C. R. North, "The Essence of Idolatry," *Von Ugarit nach Qumran. FS O. Eissfeldt. BZAW* 77 ([2]1961), 151-60; H. D. Preuss, *Verspottung fremder Religionen im AT. BWANT* 92 (1971); J. Renger and U. Seidl, "Kultbild," *RLA,* VI, 307-19; H. Ringgren, "The Symbolism of Mesopotamian Cult Images," in H. Biezais, ed., *Religious Symbols and Their Functions* (Uppsala, 1979), 105-9; W. H. Schmidt, "Ausprägungen des Bilderverbots? Zur Sichtbarkeit und Vorstellbarkeit Gottes im AT," *Das Wort und die Wörter. FS G. Friedrich* (Stuttgart, 1973), 25-34; idem, "Bilderverbot und Gottebenbildlichkeit: Exegetische Notizen zur Selbstmanipulation des Menschen," *Wort und Wahrheit* 23 (1968) 209-16; H. Schrade, *Der verborgene Gott* (Stuttgart, 1949); S. Schoer, *In Israel gab es Bilder. OBO* 74 (1987); A. Spycket, *La statuaire du Proche-Orient ancien. HO* VII/1,2 (Leiden, 1981); W. B. Tatum, "The LXX Version of the Sec-

I. Occurrences.

1. *OT Occurrences, Use, and Meaning.* Although the root *psl* is attested in both noun and verb forms in the OT, of the 60 occurrences only 6 involve verbs in the qal (Ex. 34:1,4; Dt. 10:1,3; 1 K. 5:32[Eng. 18]; Hab. 2:18). Hebrew lexicographers generally distinguish the nouns as *pesel,* with 31 occurrences in the singular, and the posited basic form **pāsîl,* with 23 occurrences in the plural.

This distinction between two different lexemes corresponds precisely to the Masoretic pointing of these forms. An investigation of all occurrences with a consideration of orthography with *y* in the plural, however, yields a different picture of the consonants. Whereas generally in the case of absent *y* (e.g., 2 Ch. 33:19; 34:3,4; Jer. 50:38; Hos. 11:2) the *y* is added or the orthography understood as defective, one can show that the orthographical variation with or without *y* is by no means arbitrary, and reflects rather quite precisely the phonetic relationships within the given word such that the *y* itself, when it is written, can only be explained as a vowel indicating a long pretonic.[1] This phenomenon can be explained only through derivation from a rare *qaṭil* form.[2] Hence one must derive the plural form of the nominal construction of *psl* from a basic form **pāsēl,* from which one can then also explain the development of the *qaṭl* form *pesel.* One additional question is whether the noun *pesel,* which in the OT is often used as a collective, can be understood as a broken or inner plural alongside the numerical plural.[3] The Masoretic pointing of the plural forms, corresponding to a *qaṭîl* type, can easily be explained purely on the numeric basis of the more frequent occurrences of the forms with the vowel *y* (17 of 23), whose basic consonantal makeup recalls this construction rather than the rare *pāsēl* type.

Both the singular and the plural forms also occur in a series of constructs, whereby the noun from *psl* generally appears as the *nomen regens,* e.g., *pesel hā'ᵃšērâ* (2 K. 21:7), *pesel hassemel* (2 Ch. 33:7), *pesel hā'ēpôḏ* (Jgs. 18:18), *pesel mîḵâ* (Jgs. 18:31),

---

ond Commandment (Ex 20,3-6 = Deut 5,7-10): A Polemic Against Idols, Not Images," *JSJ* 17 (1986) 177-95; P. Weimar, "Das Goldene Kalb: Redaktionskritische Erwägungen zu Ex 32," *BN* 38/39 (1987) 117-60; P. Welten, "Bilder II. AT," *TRE,* VI, 517-21; idem, "Götterbild, männliches," *BRL*², 99-111; idem, "Göttergruppe," *BRL*², 119-22; W. Wifall, "Models of God in the OT," *BTB* 9 (1979) 179-86; A. S. van der Woude, "Het twede Gebod," *Rondom het Woord* 19 (1967) 221-31; E. Zenger, *Israel am Sinai: Analysen und Interpretationen zu Exodus 17–34* (Altenberge, ²1985); W. Zimmerli, "Das zweite Gebot," *FS A. Bertholet* (Tübingen, 1950), 550-63 = *Gottes Offenbarung: Gesammelte Aufsätze I. ThB* 19 (²1969), 234-48; idem, "Das Bilderverbot in der Geschichte des alten Israel. Goldenes Kalb, Eherne Schlange, Mazzeben und Lade," *Schalom. FS A. Jepsen. AzT* 1/46 (1971), 86-96 = *Studien zur alttestamentlichen Theologie und Prophetie: Gesammelte Aufsätze II. ThB* 51 (1974), 247-60; idem, "Die Spendung von Schmuck für ein Kultobjekt," *Mélanges bibliques et orientaux. FS H. Cazelles. AOAT* 212 (1981), 513-28.

1. See Dohmen, "Zwei Nominalbildungen," 11-12.

2. E. König, *Historisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache,* II/1 (Leipzig, 1895), 79.

3. See Michel, 84 n. 4; S. Moscati, *Intro. to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages. PLO* 6 (³1980), §§12.43-51.

*p^esîlê *^elōhîm* (Dt. 7:25; 12:3; Isa. 21:9), *p^esîlê bāḇel* (Jer. 51:47), *p^esîlê ḵesep* (Isa. 30:22); it appears as *nomen rectum* only in *'ōḇ^edê pesel* (Ps. 97:7) and *'ereṣ p^esilîm* (Jer. 50:38).

Within the context of noun constructions, the expression *pesel ûmassēḵâ* is of particular significance because of its pivotal role in the semantic development of *pesel*. In this form the combination occurs 5 times in the MT (Dt. 27:15; Jgs. 17:3,4; 18:14; Nah. 1:14), though it probably also originally stood in Jgs. 18:17,18,20, where it was replaced during secondary redaction.[4] Syntactically and semantically, the formulation *pislî w^eniskî* in Isa. 48:5 also corresponds to this expression. The expression *'^elōhîm '^aḥērîm ûmassēḵôṯ* in 1 K. 14:9 is to be understood as a tendentious recasting of the expression *pesel ûmassēḵâ*. In using this derogatory designation to refer to Jeroboam's cultic images, the author introduces here a double allusion to the first and second commandments of the Decalogue by changing the first part of *pesel ûmassēḵâ* to *'^elōhîm '^aḥērîm* and the second to the plural form.[5] Finally, this combination also provides the basis in five additional OT passages (Isa. 30:22; 42:17; Jer. 10:14 = 51:17; Hab. 2:18) where *pesel* and *massēḵâ* correspond to one another in *parallelismus membrorum*, suggesting that the two words were separated for stylistic purposes similar to the way such separation is attested for the expression *'ēṣ wā'eḇen* in Jer. 2:27; 3:9; Hab. 2:19. Both Hebrew and Ugaritic literature attest numerous examples of hendiadys or of an expression whose corresponding constituent parts have been separated and juxtaposed in *parallelismus membrorum*.[6]

A formal consideration of the two parts of the expression *pesel ûmassēḵâ* already reveals certain semantic peculiarities. Whereas *pesel* occurs in the abs. state or in const. state with various other lexemes, *massēḵâ*, apart from a few exceptions that can be explained from the literary context (see esp. the three "isolated" occurrences in Dt. 9:12; 2 K. 17:16; Hos. 13:2),[7] occurs only as the *nomen rectum* in construct combinations with *'ēgel*, *'^elōhîm*, and *ṣelem*.[8]

The verbs associated with this noun reveal yet another peculiarity of its use. Although verbs of production are never used with the plural of *psl*, they play an enormous role in connection with the singular. The reason is that the plural, including its derogatory use,[9] always refers to the divine imagery of foreign religions such that semantically the pl. *p^esîlîm* is used exclusively to refer to the "idols of foreign gods."[10] Although the singular is frequently associated with verbs of production and cultic veneration, such association reveals more a contextual focus than any special meaning.[11] The noun *psl*

---

4. See M. Noth, "Der Hintergrund von Ri 17–18," *ABLAK*, I (1971), 136 n. 12; concerning the overall problem, see also H. M. Niemann, *Die Daniten: Studien zur Geschichte eines altisraelitischen Stammes*. *FRLANT* 135 (1985), 96-110.

5. See Dohmen, *Bilderverbot*, 56-57.

6. See M. Held, "Philological Notes on the Mari Covenant Rituals," *BASOR* 200 (1970) 37.

7. Dohmen, *Bilderverbot*, 52-53.

8. → מסכה *massēḵâ*, VIII, 435-37.

9. See B. Kedar, *Biblische Semantik* (Stuttgart, 1981), 111.

10. Hossfeld, *Dekalog*, 273.

11. See II.1 below; cf. Floss, 160; Dohmen, *Bilderverbot*, 42.

occurs almost exclusively in the context of references to imagery; one exception might be the designation *happ^esîlîm* in Jgs. 3:19,26, a geographical reference that is difficult to decipher.[12] Such terminology with reference to imagery is generally used in one of five contexts in the OT: (1) in narratives, (2) in cultic reform texts, (3) in polemical texts, (4) in texts focusing on the debate with non-Israelite gods and cultic practices, and (5) in texts associated with the prohibition of images. The term *psl* occurs in all these contexts, another indication that this root encompasses a relatively broad semantic field. The only qualification is that the noun *psl* is restricted exclusively to the religious sphere, and is not used in any secular contexts similar to those associated, e.g., with → צלם *ṣelem.*[13] The noun *psl* is clearly the most common term associated with idols in the OT.

A precise analysis of the occurrences of the noun *psl* reveals that a "basic meaning" can probably also be disclosed within the expression *pesel ûmassēḵâ.* In this hendiadys two terms describing the products of craftsmen evoke the essential elements of the entire object under discussion; the reference is to a concrete representation *(psl)* together with the products of goldsmithing necessary for cultic use *(massēḵâ).* The term *pesel* as the first in the expression quite possibly later assumed the meaning of the entire expression and, in a quasi-elliptical fashion, was able to take on the meaning "(valuable) cultic image." Against the background of the other occurrences of the nominal construction, we find that its meaning is associated with precisely the sphere encompassed in part by the term "idol" and in part by that of "cultic image." Since the functional determination (cultic sphere) accompanies all occurrences, however, whereas the substantive determination as a divine image or idol does not, the meaning of the nominal construction of *psl* in the OT seems best circumscribed by the expression "cultic image."

At first glance the meaning of the verb *psl* seems to be accurately circumscribed with "to carve out, hew [stone],"[14] especially since the semantic field that the root *psl* encompasses in other Semitic languages is restricted to the dressing or hewing of wood and stone.[15] Closer observation, however, reveals that in the OT only 1 K. 5:32(18) unequivocally refers to a "neutral" hewing in its reference to the preparation of the stones for the temple. Although the other occurrences of the verb *psl* also take the same basic meaning as their point of departure, their actual meaning is ultimately so strongly colored by the context that they require separate semantic consideration. Both Ex. 34:1,4 and Dt. 10:1,3 are directly associated with the prohibition against images and can be understood only within that context.[16] Hab. 2:18 is used within the context of extremely late polemic against divine images and is thematically related to the previously mentioned occurrences of the verb *psl.*[17]

---

12. Concerning the various interpretations, see Schroer, 307-10.
13. See Wildberger, "צֶלֶם *ṣelem* image," *TLOT* III, 1080ff.
14. See *HAL*, III, 949.
15. See I.2 below.
16. See II.1 below.
17. See II.3 below.

2. *Extrabiblical Occurrences and Etymology.* The root *psl* occurs in Northwest Semitic, where it evokes the semantic field associated with "hew, carve, etc." In Ugaritic, *psl* is a vocational designation for certain tradesmen involved in working with stones and wood.[18] The interpretation of *psltm* is disputed in several passages.[19] The various verbal and nominal occurrences of the root *psl* in Punic and Nabatean inscriptions are also associated with the sphere of wood- and stoneworking;[20] Syr. *psl*[21] and Aram. *psl/psylh* and *pslh*[22] as well as the corresponding verbal and nominal occurrences in extrabiblical Hebrew[23] are also to be understood along these semantic lines. No comparable forms of the root *psl* have yet been found in Southwest Semitic. A derivation from or at least some relationship with Akk. *pasālu,* "turn around, away,"[24] might be considered since *pasālu* is associated with the semantic field "twist, wind, wrap";[25] and a comparative-semasiological consideration[26] of the Egyptian homonym *mḏḥ*[27] is also advisable, since it too could refer both to "wrapping, binding" as well as to wood-[28] and stoneworking (see *mḏḥ nśw.t,* "stonemason"[29]).

As far as the Heb. noun *psl* is concerned, these findings suggest that the basic reference is to something that has been hewn and dressed. In the OT, however, the basic meaning attaching to the root hardly plays a role any longer except for understanding the expression *pesel ûmassēḵâ.*[30] Otherwise OT usage restricts the term to the notion of "cultic image, idol," a development worth noting especially considering that no extra-Hebrew occurrences of the root *psl* have yet been associated with terminology involving imagery.

3. *LXX.* The LXX generally renders the noun form *psl* as *glyptós* (40 times). Beyond this, no preferences for equivalents are discernible in the LXX. Once each it uses *ágalma, glýmma,* and *peribṓmion;* 4 times *glýphein;* 5 times *eídōlon;* and twice *eíkōn.*

---

18. See *WUS,* no. 2240; *UT,* no. 2073; B. Cutler and J. Macdonald, "The Unique Ugaritic Text UT 113 and the Question of 'Guilds,'" *UF* 9 (1977) 21.

19. *KTU* 1.5, VI, 18; 1.6, I, 2; see *WUS,* no. 2241; *TO,* I, 251 n. i; T. L. Fenton, "Ugaritica-Biblica," *UF* 1 (1969) 70; J. C. de Moor, "Buchbesprechung: A. S. Kapelrud, *The Violent Goddess,*" *UF* 1 (1969) 227; *CML*², 73, 156; K. Aartun, "Beiträge zum ugaritischen Lexikon," *WO* 4 (1967/68) 286; M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, "Die Trauer Els und Anats," *UF* 18 (1986) 108: "carving."

20. See *DNSI,* II, 922-23.

21. *LexSyr,* 581.

22. *DNSI,* II, 922; Beyer, 669.

23. Levy, *WTM,* IV, 71ff.

24. *AHw,* zII, 838.

25. Concerning a possible relationship with Akk. *pašālu* (*AHw,* II, 841) and *patālu* (*AHw,* II, 847) with corresponding Semitic parallels, see Dohmen, *Bilderverbot,* 43-45.

26. See W. Eilers, *Die vergleichend-semasiologische Methode in der Orientalistik. AAWLM* 10 (1974).

27. *WbÄS,* II, 190.

28. See F. Steinmann, "Untersuchungen zu den in der handwerklich-künstlerischen Produktion beschäftigen Personen und Berufsgruppen des Neuen Reichs," *ZÄS* 107 (1980) 151.

29. *WbÄS,* II, 190.

30. See I.1 above.

Except for the translation of 1 K. 5:32(Eng. 18), where it uses *hetoimázein,* the LXX renders the verb *psl* as *laxeúein.*

It is worth noting that with a single exception, the LXX always renders the noun *pesel* in the Pentateuch with a corresponding form of *glyptós;* only in the two versions of the Decalogue in Ex. 20:4 and Dt. 5:8 does the LXX use *eídōlon,* betraying a late interpretation that reads the first and second Decalogue commandments together and against this background understands the second as prohibiting "divine images" (idols) rather than cultic or similar images in the general sense.[31]

II. Central Themes in the OT. A statistical survey of the occurrences of the root *psl* in the OT already discloses certain emphases in its use betraying differing origins and intentions. Generally speaking, three thematic spheres emerge: (1) texts associated with the prohibition of images; (2) texts concerned with the debate with foreign religions; and (3) texts involved in polemic against images. Narratives never mention *psl* in any neutral context.[32]

1. *Prohibition of Images.* Among texts more closely associated with the OT prohibition of images, *pesel* appears first in the short prohibitive *lō'-ta'ᵃśeh-lᵉḵā pesel,* an expression formulated for the basic text of the Decalogue in Dt. 5 during the early Dtr period.[33] The expression does, however, have both stylistic and substantive precursors. First, it was probably inspired by the old introduction to cultic law in the Covenant Code, Ex. 20:23.[34] Second, Manasseh's "cultic sacrilege" probably prompted the use of the designation *pesel* since the cultic image of Asherah that Manasseh had made and that he then erected is called *pesel hā'ᵃšērâ* in 2 K. 21:7; in 2 Ch. 33:7 it is then called *pesel hassemel,* and in 2 Ch. 33:15 simply *hassemel.* If one also understands Nah. 1:14 as being directed against Manasseh,[35] then the designation *pesel ûmassēḵâ* also applies to this cultic image. It is not surprising that a formulation intended to be universally valid, such as was probably the case with regard to the basic text of the Decalogue, would restrict this terminology to *pesel.*[36] The contemporary background also supports this view insofar as it was the author JE, writing precisely during the time of Manasseh, who first characterized the worship of images as a sin by inserting his narrative Ex. 32* into the Sinai theophany. He provided the concrete material necessary for the emergence of the prohibition of images by making the actual transition from the demand for exclusive worship of Yahweh to the classification of the veneration of images as a sin, which in its own turn obstructs that demand.[37] JE carries out this characterization espe-

---

31. See the detailed discussion in Tatum.

32. Concerning the background of Jgs. 17–18, see Niemann, *Daniten,* 61-147; concerning the functional relationship with Dt. 27:15, see Dohmen, *Bilderverbot,* 234-35.

33. See Hossfeld, *Dekalog,* 273.

34. For a reconstruction and a discussion of content, see Dohmen, *Bilderverbot,* 154-80.

35. Jörg Jeremias, *Kultprophetie und Gerichtsverkündigung in der späten Königszeit Israels. WMANT* 35 (1970), 22ff.

36. See I.1 above.

37. Concerning the disposition of the JE Sinai theophany, see Dohmen, *Bilderverbot,* 132-41.

cially through the emphatic introduction of the "table motif" (see *luḥōṯ 'eḇen* in 24:12; 31:18; 32:19). The theophany, given quasi-documentation in the tables themselves, is destroyed by the sin of idol worship (the shattering of the tables in 32:19), and the introduction of the privileged status in Ex. 34 (without tables!) constitutes a new relationship between God and people.

"A Dtr redactor who combined the Tetrateuch together with Deuteronomy itself, which in the meantime had grown larger, had to clarify the relationship between the privileged status within the 'covenant of Moses' in Ex. 34 and the Decalogue within the 'covenant of Horeb' in Dt. 5:9ff. After the worship of the calf in Ex. 32, he recast chap. 34 under the influence of Dt. 9–10 into a covenant renewal."[38] Ex. 34:1,4 and Dt. 10:1,3 with the verbal forms of *psl* can also be explained in connection with the disposition of this redaction, since on the one hand this redactor[39] incorporates the traditional understanding of the tables, and yet on the other already formulates it against the background of the Decalogue, in the present instance especially against the background of the prohibition of images. In these passages the hewing of the new tables for the Decalogue is described with the verb *psl,* providing an association with the prohibition of images in the Decalogue in that in the context of this particular description, the ultimate intention is indeed a confrontation between word and image.

The formulation in Dt. 10:4 especially underscores this finding; reference to Yahweh's speaking on the mountain from within the fire on the day of assembly[40] alludes to Dt. 4:12, where the alternative between the spoken word and the unseen form also served as the point of departure for a great redactional parenesis concerning the prohibition of images.[41] Hence in Ex. 34:1,4 and Dt. 10:1,3, the verb *psl* evokes the special connotative function, playing off the idea of "production," of indicating the only legitimate alternative to the forbidden *'āśâ pesel* (Dt. 5:8; Ex. 20:4). Picking up on Dt. 4:9-13, the expansion in Dt. 4:15-16a*(without *semel*),19-28 then shaped the first expansion of the Decalogue prohibition of images through *kol-tᵉmûnâ.*[42] The monotheism emerging during the exilic period then effectively repressed the first commandment of the Decalogue while simultaneously giving priority to the second.

This background also explains the tendency in late postexilic texts to expand the Decalogue's prohibition of images substantively from a prohibition of cultic images into a prohibition of *any* portrayal within the cultic sphere. It is within the same context that the corresponding Dtr expansions in the book of Hosea (see Hos. 8:6; 11:2; 13:2; 14:4[3])[43] are to be understood. These expansions interpret the earlier Hoseanic "critique of imagery" from the perspective of the Decalogue's own prohibition of images and expand the content of that critique against the background of polemic debate. The

38. Hossfeld, *Dekalog,* 210.
39. See also Zenger, 130ff.
40. For a more precise description of this redactional material, see F.-L. Hossfeld, *Unterwegs zur Kirche: Alttestamentliche Konzeptionen. QD* 110 (1987), esp. 130ff.
41. See Knapp, 61-62.
42. See Dohman, *Bilderverbot,* 218ff.
43. Ibid., 148-51, 259-60, esp. nn. 243, 249.

expansion of content can be found in the addition to the Decalogue's prohibition of images and its emendation for the version of Ex. 20 and in the additions in Dt. 4:16*,17-18 and in Lev. 19:4; 26:1; and Dt. 27:15, which applies the prohibition of images explicitly to the sphere of the private cult and is the only commandment affecting the worship of God to appear in the surrounding context.[44]

2. *Foreign Religions.* Yahweh's claim to exclusivity, a claim essential for OT religion,[45] prompted debates with other religions and attempts to delimit the Israelites' own religion from those others. Especially the Dtn-Dtr texts whose goal was to eradicate and destroy all foreign cultic objects (see Ex. 34:13;[46] Dt. 7:5,25; 12:3[47]) attest the fundamental importance of these debates with foreign religions and their references to those religions' images and cultic objects.[48] The so-called cultic reform texts of the Dtr History and the Chronicler's History are at least indirectly associated with these debates with foreign religions and their demands that all cultic objects foreign to Yahweh be destroyed.[49] As clearly shown by comparable prophetic texts (e.g., Isa. 10:10; 21:9; Jer. 51:47), texts involved in this debate with foreign religions are not associated with any specifically formulated prohibition of images; their motivation is rather the demand to worship Yahweh alone, something attested especially by their use of terminology from the sphere of prostitution.[50] It is even possible that certain coins were later called "harlot's pay" because of the images on them.[51] Substantive overlapping emerges only with respect to the polemic against divine images,[52] since such debate with foreign religions occasionally uses the corresponding polemical devices in its own argumentation.

3. *Polemic against Divine Images.* The polemic against divine images found especially in Deutero-Isaiah (though even there generally only as secondary material[53]) and wisdom literature[54] is to be distinguished substantively from the prohibition of images. This polemic actually constitutes a late parallel development to the prohibition of images, since the purpose of both polemic and prohibition is to thwart present danger. Not

---

44. See H.-J. Fabry, "Noch ein Dekalog!" *Im Gespräch mit dem dreieinigen Gott. FS W. Breuning,* ed. M. Böhnke and H. Heinz (Düsseldorf, 1985), 75-96.

45. See M. Rose, *Der Ausschliesslichkeitsanspruch Jahwes. BWANT* 106 (1975).

46. See in this regard Dohmen, *Bilderverbot,* 257 n. 63.

47. On this point see H. Spieckermann, *Juda unter Assur in der Sargonidenzeit. FRLANT* 129 (1982), 217 n. 123.

48. Concerning this entire complex, see G. Schmitt, *Du sollst keinen Frieden schließen mit den Bewohnern des Landes. BWANT* 91 (1970).

49. See Spieckermann, *Juda unter Assur;* H.-D. Hoffmann, *Reform und Reformen. ATANT* 66 (1980), esp. 323-66 concerning the Dtn-Dtr cultic language.

50. → זנה *zānâ (zānāh),* IV, 101ff.

51. Concerning, e.g., Isa. 23:17, see T. Fischer and U. Rüterswörden, *WO* 12 (1983) 48 n. 70.

52. See II.3 below.

53. See K. Kiesow, *Exodustexte im Jesajabuch: Literarkritische und motivgeschichtliche Analysen. OBO* 24 (1979), 159 n. 2.

54. See Eising; G. von Rad, *Wisdom in Israel* (Eng. trans. 1972), 177-85.

surprisingly, in some late OT texts, polemic against divine images and the prohibition of images can appear alongside one another or even intertwined. Such texts include especially Isa. 10; Hab. 2:18-20 (→ עשׂה *'āśâ*); Ps. 135, and many others. This relationship is also articulated by the juxtaposition of the expression *ma'aśēh yād* with *'elōhîm 'ahērîm* in Jer. 1:16.[55] Yet even though the polemic and prohibition do share a common goal, namely, the rejection of images, their motivation and origin are quite different; whereas the prohibition is grounded in the specific history of Israel's own faith, the polemic is rooted ultimately in a rational debate concerning the nature of images themselves, a debate also carried on within the Hellenistic and Roman spheres.[56] The use of such texts in Deutero-Isaiah shows one particularly significant feature within the OT, since there the detailed polemic underscores the repression of the visual element already found in this context.

III. Qumran. Apart from the Pentateuch citations in 11QT, *psl* occurs in the Qumran texts only in 1QpHab 12:10-13, which quotes Hab. 2:18 and then "interprets" it as follows: *pšr hdbr 'l kwl psly hgwym 'šr yṣrwn l'wbdm wlšthwt.* Apart from the type of exegesis (→ פשׁר *pešer*), this passage offers nothing new over against Hab. 2:18 itself.[57] The extended polemic against divine images is merely applied to the juxtaposition of the believing community on the one hand and the godless world of its enemies and opponents on the other whose cult is characterized as "image worship."

Dohmen

55. → יד *yād,* V, 426.

56. See B. Gladigow, "Zur Konkurrenz von Bild und Namen im Aufbau theistischer Systeme," *Wort und Bild,* ed. Brunner, et al., 103-22.

57. See II.3 above; and A. Deissler, *Zwölf Propheten II. NEB* (1981), 229-30.

פָּעַל *pā'al;* פֹּעַל *pō'al;* פְּעֻלָּה *pe'ullâ;* מִפְעָל *mip'āl*

Contents: I. Etymology. II. Occurrences and Distribution. III. Verb: 1. Human Beings as Subjects; 2. God as Subject. IV. Substantive *pō'al*: 1. Human Deeds; 2. God's Deeds. V. Substantive *pe'ullâ*. VI. Substantive *mip'āl*. VII. Qumran. VIII. LXX.

pā'al. R. Humbert, "L'emploi du verbe *pā'al* et de ses dérivés substantifs en hébreu biblique," *ZAW* 65 (1953) 35-44; O. Keel, *Feinde und Gottesleugner: Studien zum Image der Widersacher in den Individualpsalmen. SBM* 7 (1969); R. P Merendino, *Der Erste und der Letzte: Eine Untersuchung von Jes 40–48. SVT* 37 (1981); G. von Rad, "Das Werk Jahwes," *Studia Biblica et*

I. Etymology. The root *p'l* meaning "to make, do," is attested in several Semitic languages. In Middle Hebrew the verb means "to work." Only nouns are attested in Jewish Aramaic (e.g., *pā'ᵃlā'*, "worker"; cf. Sam. *py'l*, "act, deed";[1] Egyp. Aram. *p'l*, "to make," on an Elephantine ostracon[2] is probably a Canaanitism); the verb ("to work") is not attested until it appears in Syriac. In Phoenician and Punic, *p'l* is the customary word for "to make, do."[3] The same meaning is exhibited by Arab. *fa'ala;* OSA *f'l* means "to make," while the derivative noun means "worker."[4] No agreement exists yet whether Ugar. *b'l*, "to make," "to work,"[5] is identical with *p'al;*[6] the root *p'l* is attested in PNs: *yp'l, mn p'l*.[7] The root is not found in Akkadian or Ethiopic. Hebrew more frequently uses → עשׂה *'āśâ* to render this notion, though also → עלל *'ll;* in Aramaic the customary word is *'bd* (which in Hebrew means "to serve").

II. Occurrences and Distribution. The verb occurs 56 times in the MT, or 57 times if one emends Job 37:12.[8] All the occurrences are in the qal and are found in the Psalms (26 times), Job (11/12), Isaiah (7), Proverbs (4), Hosea (2), and elsewhere (6). The subst. *pō'al* occurs 38 times (37 discounting Job 37:12): Deuteronomy (2), Job (6/5 times), Psalms (11), Proverbs (5), Isaiah (6), Jeremiah (3), Habakkuk (2), and elsewhere (3). The 14 occurrences of the subst. *pᵉ'ullâ* are found in the Psalms (3), Proverbs (2), Isaiah (5), and elsewhere (4). The subst. *mip'āl* occurs 3 times (twice in the Psalms, once in Proverbs). The root *p'l* thus occurs 111 times, a relatively small number compared to the more than 2,800 occurrences of → עשׂה *'āśâ*. The distribution of *p'l* already clearly reveals that this root was used more in poetic contexts. The few occurrences in prose and legal texts can be viewed either as elevated style or as extremely late texts. It is doubtful there is any historical explanation for this usage, e.g., that the root was viewed suspiciously in Israel because of its alleged Canaanite and Phoenician origin and thus receded in favor of the root *'śh*.[9] The root *p'l* was poetic and its use thus restricted from the outset.

III. Verb.

1. *Human Beings as Subjects.* When used with a human subject, the verb means "to make, do," and is often accompanied by an object expressing either a positive or nega-

---

Semitica. FS T. C. Vriezen (Wageningen, 1966), 290-98 = *GSAT. ThB* 48 (1973), 236-44; J. Vollmer, "פעל *p'l* to make, do," *TLOT*, II, 1014-18; J. T. Willis, "On the Text of Micah 2,1aα-β," *Bibl* 48 (1967) 534-41, esp. 536-37.

1. *LOT*, II, 565.
2. *KAI* 271A.1.
3. *DNSI*, II, 924ff.
4. Biella, 407.
5. *WUS*, no. 546.
6. L. L. Grabbe, "Hebrew *PA'AL*/Ugaritic *B'L*," *UF* 11 (1979) 307-14.
7. *PNU*, 171.
8. *HAL*, III, 950.
9. So Humbert, 36-37.

tive action, though positive objects are rare: *ṣeḏeq* (Ps. 15:2) and *mišpāṭ* (Zeph. 2:3), the reference being to keeping God's commandments. Objects such as *šeqer*, "lie," *'āwen, 'awlâ, rā'*, "evil," "wickedness" (Hos. 7:1; Job 34:32; Ps. 119:3; Mic. 2:1), occur far more frequently. The active participle together with the subst. *'āwen* (→ און *'āwen*) constitutes the fixed expression *pō'ᵃlê 'āwen*, "evildoer." Because this expression occurs no less than 23 times, primarily in the Psalms, the question arises whether the reference is to a specific group. The expression is an extremely general one, however, and parallels *mᵉrē'îm* ("wicked ones," Isa. 31:2; Ps. 64:3[Eng. 2]), *hôlᵉlîm* ("boastful ones," Ps. 5:6[5]), and *rᵉšā'îm* ("godless, wicked ones," 28:3; 92:8[7]; 101:8, and elsewhere). These "evildoers" belong to the largest group of "enemies of the individual" and share this group's indistinct identity.[10] Petitioners who often feel they are persecuted either as "righteous" *(ṣaddîq)* or "without reason" *(ḥinnām)* are concerned not with any precise identification or number of their enemies, but only with prompting God to intervene by emphasizing how numerous and dangerous those enemies are. Moreover, such evildoers are also God's own enemies. One frequently emphasized characteristic of these "evildoers" is their speaking (e.g., Ps. 5:6-7[5-6]; 28:3; 64:3,4,9[2,3,8]; 94:2-4; Mic. 2:1). Since this speaking is often associated with an illness or an accusation directed toward the petitioner, it is not surprising that the evildoers' presence is expressed as speaking; here the notion of the fateful, magical word plays a role.

The use of *pā'al* in reference to the making of idols in Isa. 44:9-20 is also unique, since otherwise *yāṣar, nāsaḵ,* and *'āśâ* are generally used in such contexts. The absolute use of the verb in v. 12 is striking, since *pā'al* is otherwise used absolutely only with God as its subject (41:4; 43:13). The author is probably using the terms *yāṣar* and *pā'al* intentionally as ironic or derogatory expressions for human idolatry, since in Deutero-Isaiah *yāṣar* (→ יצר) especially refers to God's own creative activity.[11]

2. *God as Subject.* With God as its subject, *pā'al* refers either to his mighty deeds in history or to his anticipated, imminent intervention. The former provide reason to hope that the latter will indeed take place. Ex. 15:17 praises the selection of Zion and the construction of the temple as the conclusion of the liberation from Egypt. Nu. 23:23b appends to Balaam's second oracle a reflection on Yahweh's miraculous help. Dt. 32:27 articulates Yahweh's self-reflection in suggesting that Israel's enemies might conclude that the defeat of Israel was their own rather than Yahweh's doing. The deed known even to the ancestors in Ps. 44:2(1) (*pō'al pā'altā bîmêhem,* "what deed you performed in their [the ancestors'] days") refers to Yahweh's conquest of the land for his people.

Just as Yahweh is responsible for the Chaldeans' punishment of Israel (Hab. 1:6), so also will he bring about Israel's deliverance from exile (Isa. 41:4). Yahweh is the first and the last: "Ultimately the argument is not this or that mighty deed of Yahweh, but

---

10. See Keel, 98ff.

11. See Merendino, 383, who remarks only that in Isa. 44:9-13 the two verbs are "not used theologically."

rather his divine being as such, which in absolute freedom is the creative source of all that is and all that happens. Knowledge of Yahweh as the only source of cosmic reality allows no other explanation for all that happens even in the present."[12]

The Psalter also intimately associates future hope with past experience. The congregation collectively affirms that Yahweh will continue to preserve his people just as he redeemed them earlier (Ps. 68:29[28]; 74:12). Similarly, the individual petitioner is able to find refuge from enemies in Yahweh (31:20[19]). Elihu summons Job to acknowledge and praise God's works but not to question them (Job 36:23-24). The goal of Elihu's theodicy is to "ascribe righteousness to my Maker" (*lᵉpō'ᵃlî 'ettēn-ṣeḏeq,* 36:3).

IV. Substantive *pō'al*. Like the verb, the subst. *pō'al* is used to refer to both human deeds and God's works.

1. *Human Deeds.* Human deeds can be qualified, e.g., as *pō'al ḥāmās,* "wicked deed" (par. *ma'ᵃśê 'āwen,* "works of iniquity," Isa. 59:6). Elsewhere the negative nature of the action is contextually construed (e.g., Job 36:9; Ps. 28:4; Prov. 24:12,29; Isa. 29:15; Jer. 25:14; 50:29), and occasional reference is also made to God's recompense (*šlm,* Ruth 2:12; Job 34:11; Jer. 25:14; *hēšîḇ,* Prov. 24:12,29).

The substantive can also refer in a completely neutral fashion to the work of everyday life (Ps. 104:23) or to one's personal conduct (Prov. 20:11; 21:8). It can also take on the meaning "wages" (Job 7:2; Jer. 22:13). In the compound expression *raḇ-pᵉ'ālîm,* it functions as an honorific title insofar as either Benaiah or his father (cf. *BHS*) is a "doer of great deeds" (2 S. 23:20 = 1 Ch. 11:22). Like the verb, the substantive used with a human subject almost always has negative connotations, though neutral and even positive connotations are also attested.

2. *God's Deeds.* God's deeds are often referred to with a paronomastic expression: *pō'al pā'altā bîmêhem,* "what deeds you performed in their days" (Ps. 44:2[1]),[13] and *kî pō'al pō'ēl bîmêḵem,* "for a work is being done in your [the listeners'] days" (Hab. 1:5[14]). Although the expressions are quite similar, their temporal references move in completely different directions. Ps. 44:2(1) refers to the expulsion of the Canaanites during the land conquest, Hab. 1:5 to the imminent arousing of the Chaldeans against the apostates among the Israelites themselves. Both temporal references recur in other passages as well. Ps. 95:9 refers to the Massah-Meribah tradition in Ex. 17. Ps. 77:12-13(11-12) and 143:5 similarly refer to salvific deeds in the people's history. Ps. 111:3 characterizes Yahweh's *pō'al* as *hôḏ-wᵉhāḏār,* "majesty and honor."

One may also expect, however, that Yahweh will act similarly in the future on behalf of his people or the individual (e.g., Ps. 64:10[9]; 90:16), though occasionally the de-

---

12. Merendino, 130.

13. See III.2 above.

14. Concerning the text, cf. *BHS* and W. Rudolph, *Micha — Nahum — Habakuk — Zephanja. KAT* XIII/3 (1975), 203.

scription is so general that one cannot determine whether the reference is to history or to world dominion in the larger sense (Dt. 32:4; Job 36:24; Ps. 92:5[4]). Von Rad is probably correct in suspecting that "all these passages belong to a specific cultic tradition and phraseology," and that the term *pō'al* "originally evoked the miraculous events of the exodus or of the entry into Canaan, and thence was adopted into the language used in petitions of the individual."[15]

The subst. *pō'al* also occurs in prophetic writings. Apart from Hab. 1:5 (see above), Hab. 3:2 also focuses on Yahweh's mighty deeds. Isa. 45:9 and 11, although somewhat obscure, apparently refer to the future. Merendino believes that in both instances Yahweh's *pō'al* is Israel itself: Yahweh is the creator, Israel the work of creation.[16] By contrast, von Rad adduces v. 13 in understanding v. 11 as a reference to Cyrus and Yahweh's work through him.[17] Whether Israel or Cyrus, the reference is to historical entities that as such are Yahweh's works. Von Rad concludes that in the case of both *pō'al* and *ma'ᵃśeh,* we are dealing with stereotypical and absolutized terms referring to divine rule as such rather than to any specific deed in history.[18]

The subst. *pō'al* occasionally also refers to the activity of clouds or lightning as executors of God's will (Job 37:12). In Elihu's theodicy, where righteousness is ascribed to God as creator (*pō'ēl,* 36:3),[19] God's creative activity manifests itself in atmospheric phenomena (cf. vv. 27-33).

V. Substantive *pᵉ'ullâ.* In connection with human beings, the subst. *pᵉ'ullâ* means "work," "action," "wage"; in connection with God, it similarly means "action," "reward," and "punishment."[20] In Jer. 31:16 and 2 Ch. 15:7, *pᵉ'ullâ* refers to work for which a certain wage or payment *(śāḵār)* is set. Both passages concern divine assurance for the "work" of enduring imprisonment (Jer. 31:16) or hostile attack (2 Ch. 15:7). Lev. 19:13 refers in a completely concrete manner to the wages of the day laborer: *pᵉ'ullaṯ śāḵîr.* In Ezk. 29:20 Egypt is the "payment" Nebuchadnezzar receives "for the work he did before Tyre."[21] Prov. 10:16 contrasts *pᵉ'ullaṯ ṣaddîq,* "the wage of the righteous," with *tᵉḇû'aṯ rāšā',* "the gain of the wicked." Prov. 11:18 uses the contrast *pᵉ'ullaṯ-šāqer,* "deceptive wages," and *śeḵer 'ᵉmeṯ,* "sure reward." The plural construction *lip'ullôṯ 'āḏām* in Ps. 17:4 is probably best understood as "with regard to human works" or something similar.[22] In 28:5 *pᵉ'ullôṯ yhwh,* "Yahweh's works," parallels *ma'ᵃśēh yāḏāyw,* "the work of his hands," i.e., both refer to God's deeds, albeit deeds unacknowledged here by the wicked. In the MT of 109:20 the expression *pᵉ'ullaṯ*

---

15. Von Rad, 291. On the use of the subst. *ma'ᵃśeh,* which is often used as a parallel, → עשׂה *'āśâ* and see von Rad, 291ff.
16. Merendino, 427.
17. Von Rad, 294.
18. Ibid., 295.
19. See III.2 above.
20. *HAL,* II, 951.
21. See W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1983), 117, 119-20.
22. See H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59* (Eng. trans. 1987), 243.

śōṭᵉnay, "the reward of my accusers," is explained by the addendum *mē'ēṯ yhwh,* "from Yahweh." If one eliminates this gloss, the meaning is probably closer to "the deed of my prosecutors [or 'accusers']."[23] In that case vv. 6-20 would describe the "cursed work" of the adversaries. By inserting the gloss, the MT intends the *pᵉ'ullâ* to be understood as "wage" in the sense of "punishment" of the adversaries through Yahweh.

In the Suffering Servant's song in Isa. 49:1-6, the servant's right *(mišpāṭ)* and recompense *(pᵉ'ullâ)* are to be found with God (v. 4b) after his activity among human beings proves to be futile (v. 4a). In 40:10 and 62:11, it is Yahweh himself who after strenuous work returns with his "reward" *(śᵉḵārô)* and (par.) "yield" *(pᵉ'ullāṯô;* NRSV "recompense"). In 62:11 "recompense" clearly refers to Israel, which has been liberated from exile. For 40:10 scholars have adduced Gen. 30:28,32-33; 31:8, where *śāḵār* refers to Jacob's acquisition of sheep and goats. What we would have here is an image of Yahweh as the shepherd.[24] The term *pᵉ'ullâ* is used yet again as a reference to recompense for Yahweh's servants in Isa. 61:8, and negatively as a reference to punishment or vengeance for the wicked in 65:7 (see the discussion of Ps. 109:20 above). The meaning of *pᵉ'ullâ* is, however, generally positive.

VI. Substantive *mip̱'āl.* The subst. *mip'āl* occurs only 3 times, always plural and always as a reference to Yahweh's works. In Prov. 8:22 Wisdom speaks of itself as *rē'šîṯ darkô,* the "beginning of his [God's] work," par. to *qeḏem mip'ālāyw,* the "first of his acts." In Ps. 46:9(8) *mip̱'ᵃlôṯ yhwh* refers to "Yahweh's works" par. to *šammôṯ,* "terrors," evoking the kind of terrifying works Yahweh has performed such as the exodus from Egypt (cf. Ex. 10:2; Ps. 78:43). Ps. 66:5 similarly associates the *mip'ᵃlôṯ yhwh* with a description of Yahweh as *nôrā' 'ᵃlîlâ,* "terrible in his rule." The following verse then describes how the Israelites passed through the sea during the exodus. One should not, however, conclude from these three examples that *mip'āl* refers only to God's deeds in history. Sir. 15:19 uses the expression *mip̱'al 'îš* to refer to a "human deed" that cannot escape God's notice.

VII. Qumran. The Qumran writings generally use the verb with an abstract object to mean "do, perform" *reša'* (1QH 14:14), works or ways of the *tô'ēḇâ* (1QpHab 12:8; 8:13), though also once with God as the subject: "you have done this" (1QH 11:33). The noun *pᵉ'ullâ* occurs 6 times. Human beings "fulfill" their works according to God's plan (1QS 3:16). The performance of their works *(pᵉ'ullaṯ ma'ᵃśêhem)* comes about through the two spirits (1QS 4:15). God knows the deeds of the spirits (1QS 4:25). The occurrences in the *Hodayot* are fragmentary. 1QH 14:12 speaks of human deeds in connection with the spirits. 1QH 15:22 says that God "shaped" *(yṣr)* the spirits and "established" *(hēḵîn)* their works. 1QH 11:34 cannot be reliably reconstructed. The root does not occur in the Temple Scroll.

---

23. So H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150* (Eng. trans. 1989), 336.

24. So K. Elliger, *Deuterojesaja (40,1–45,7). BK* XI/1 (1978), 37; cf. P.-E. Bonnard, *Le second Isaïe. ÉBib* (1972), 92; and Merendino, 68.

VIII. LXX. The LXX renders *pā'al* most frequently with *ergázesthai,* though it also uses *poieín* and *prássein.* It renders both *pō'al* and *pᵉ'ullâ* as *érgon* and *ergasía,* though also as *misthós.* It uses other translations in isolated instances.

Illman

פעם *p'm;* פַּעַם *pa'am;* פַּעֲמוֹן *pa'ᵃmôn*

Contents: I. Root and Distribution. II. 1. OT Forms and Occurrences; 2. Combinations and Parallel Terms. III. General Use: 1. Verb *p'm;* 2. Substantive *pa'am;* 3. Substantive *pa'ᵃmôn.* IV. Theological Considerations. V. Qumran and LXX.

I. Root and Distribution. The root *p'm* occurs in all but the South Semitic languages, and is attested especially in the Northwest Semitic linguistic sphere; cf. Akk. *pêmu(m)/pênu,* "thigh" (of human beings, gods, even animals);[1] Ugaritic attests both *p'n,* "foot,"[2] and *p'm* (pl. *p'mt*), "time [in the numerical sense, "occurrence"]";[3] also Phoen. *p'm* (so also in the dual), "foot/feet,"[4] and reduplicated *p'm p'm,* "step by step,"[5] as well as Punic with a double pl., *p'mm,* "feet,"[6] alongside *p'm't,*[7] "times [in the numerical sense],"[8] which in the latter case has also been construed as a plural form from the sg. *p'mh/p'mt,* "time [in the numerical sense]."[9] See also *'d p'm,*[10] which probably means either (temporally) "yet one more time,"[11] or

---

p'm. J. Barr, *Biblical Words for Time. SBT* I/33 (²1969), 113-14, 122; Caquot, et al., *TO,* I, 166, 343; J. A. Emerton, "Notes on Two Proposed Emendations in the Book of Judges (11,24 and 16,28)," *ZAW* 85 (1973) 220-23, esp. 221-22; J. Friedrich, *Phönizisch-punische Grammatik. AnOr* 46 (²1970); P. Fronzaroli, "Studi sul lessico comune semitico," *AANLR* 19 (1964), 261, 274, 279; E. Jenni, "עֵת *'ēt,* time," *TLOT,* II, 951-61, esp. 956-57; E. Kolari, *Musikinstrumente und ihre Verwendung im AT* (Helsinki, 1947); J. Niehaus, "*pa'am 'eḥāt* and the Israelite Conquest," *VT* 30 (1980) 236-39; → יום *yôm,* VI, 7ff.; → עת *'ēṯ.*

1. *AHw,* II, 854.

2. See *WUS,* no. 2243; *UT,* no. 2076; *CML*², 156; and G. D. Young, *Concordance of Ugaritic. AnOr* 36 (1956), no. 1560, with references; otherwise A. Schoors, *RSP,* I, 58; M. Dahood, ibid., 315-16; concerning *KTU* 1.12, I, 40, see the discussion in III.2 below concerning Isa. 41:7.

3. *WUS,* no. 2185; *UT,* no. 1998; *CML* (²1978), 155; Young, *Concordance,* no. 1507, with references; with regard to *KTU* 1.23, I, 20, one finds a different interpretation in *TO,* I, 372.

4. *KAI* 18.7; 26A.I 16; *DNSI,* II, 928.

5. *KAI* 27.20; but cf. *KAI,* II, 46; R. Degen, W. W. Müller, and W. Röllig, *Neue Ephemeris für Semitische Epigraphik,* II (Wiesbaden, 1972), 19.

6. *KAI* 69.4, 6, 8, 10.

7. *KAI* 120.1.

8. Also *DNSI,* II, 928-29; Friedrich, §§226, 230-31, 236.

9. *DNSI,* II, 928-29.

10. *KAI* 68.5.

11. So *KAI,* II, 32; cf. Friedrich, §§247, 248b.

"many times";[12] and finally Sam. *fam*[13] and probably also inscriptional Heb. *hp'm,*[14] which perhaps means "finally."[15]

This survey already reveals that we are dealing only with the nouns at this point; they often have the concrete sense of "foot," though also "step" or "time" in the numerical sense. Not only is the etymological question concerning the roots of these words difficult to answer; it is complicated even further by the double plural forms as well as by uncertainty concerning the gender of some of the words. These difficulties are discernible in the OT as well[16] and cannot be explained as easily as C. H. Gordon believes, who asserts that "פעם is a blend of *p'm* 'time' and *p'n* 'foot,' having the meanings of both."[17]

II. 1. *OT Forms and Occurrences.* The OT forms and occurrences correspond largely to the overall Semitic evidence discussed above except that a verb *p'm* is also attested, occurring 5 times, including once in the qal[18] or piel (Jgs. 13:25),[19] 3 times in the niphal (Gen. 41:8; Ps. 77:5[Eng. 4]; Dnl. 2:3), and once in the hithpael (Dnl. 2:1). Unfortunately, the exact meaning of the verb[20] and its relationship with the nouns of this group are by no means completely clear. The noun *pa'am,* which occurs 118 times (46 in the sg., 9 in the dual, 63 in the pl.), and the noun *pa'ᵃmōn,* occurring 7 times (Ex. 28:33-34; 39:25-26), are generally understood as derivatives of the verb *p'm.*[21] Zorell, however, rejects the derivation of *pa'ᵃmōn* from *p'm,* and *HAL* calls it into question. *HAL* also notes that *pa'am* might be a primary noun. The inner relationships among the word group as a whole, however, can probably be sorted out semantically.[22]

Even-Shoshan also assumes the presence of a feminine derivative, namely, *pa'ᵃmâ* as a singular from the pl. *pᵉ'āmôṯ,* which occurs 3 times in reference to the feet of an object (the ark or the frame; Ex. 25:12; 37:3; 1 K. 7:30), and which Mandelkern identifies as a second plural of *pa'am.* Even-Shoshan's assumption, however, which would thus reckon 115 occurrences of *pa'am,* is probably not necessary,[23] since extrabiblical evidence also attests a shift in gender,[24] a situation also applying to the sg. *pa'am,*

---

12. So Y. Avishur, "Studies of Stylistic Features Common to the Phoenician Inscriptions and the Bible," *UF* 8 (1976) 13.
13. *LOT,* II, 559, 80-84.
14. *KAI* 188.2.
15. *KAI,* II, 185-86; but cf. also *TSSI,* I, 15.
16. See II, III below.
17. *UT,* no. 1998.
18. Thus the traditional view; cf., e.g., *GesB,* 652; *BDB,* 821; *KBL²,* 771; Lisowsky, 1177.
19. Suggested by *LexHebAram,* 661; and *HAL,* III, 952, directly accepted by Even-Shoshan, 1779; see also III.1 below.
20. See III.1 below.
21. See *GesB; BDB; BLe,* 456k.
22. See III below.
23. See *HAL,* III, 953.
24. See I above.

which is identified as a feminine noun but can be treated as masculine (Jgs. 16:28; 2 S. 23:8).[25]

The noun *pa'am* occurs primarily in narrative (and legal) texts of the historical writings, including 36 times in the Tetrateuch, 50 in the Dtr History, 8 in the Chronicler's History (including Nehemiah), as well as 8 times each in the prophetic writings and Psalms (though only in the pl.), and finally 7 times in the wisdom texts and once in Canticles.

2. *Combinations and Parallel Terms.* The main focus of this group is thus the subst. *pa'am.* Because the word is used primarily as a temporal reference,[26] the group as a whole has very few parallel terms (though see Isa. 66:8). Such are used especially in a concrete or figurative sense, and particularly as synonyms, as in Isa. 26:6 with *regel,* the most frequent Hebrew word for "foot,"[27] in Ps. 17:5 with *'ašuray,* "steps" (see *BHS*), and in the difficult passage Isa. 41:7, where *paṭṭîš,* (large) "hammer,"[28] parallels *pa'am.*[29] Used temporally, *pa'am* also appears in several almost formulaic combinations.[30]

III. General Use.

1. *Verb p'm.* Use of the rare verb *p'm* is quite consistent, and the similar manner of expression in Gen. 41:8 and Dnl. 2:1 even suggests that the distinction between the niphal and hithpael has been weakened somewhat. In 4 of 5 occurrences the verb is used with *rûaḥ,* "spirit." Once (Jgs. 13:25) the reference is to Yahweh's spirit who actively influences or "stirs" someone (Samson).[31] In the other occurrences a person's spirit (Gen. 41:8: Pharaoh; Dnl. 2:1,3: Nebuchadnezzar; cf. Ps. 77:4,7[3,6]) is moved or stirred by a dream (*ḥ^alôm;* → חלם *ḥālam*) (Gen. 41:8; Dnl. 2:1; cf. Ps. 77:5[4]). Here the person is not only "disturbed" *(GesB),* the person's spirit can also be "moved/anxious/restless" to learn the meaning of the dream (*wattippā'em rûḥî lāḏa'aṯ 'eṯ-haḥ^alôm,* Dnl. 2:3). Hence the G stem (qal) of the verb means something similar to "move, stir," while the D stem (piel) has the concrete meaning of "set into motion, stir, move,"[32] in which case the form in Jgs. 13:25 can be understood as piel (Even-Shoshan).[33]

2. *Substantive pa'am.* The subst. *pa'am* exhibits a connection with the verb first of all in the concrete meaning "foot/feet" (the parallel synonym in Isa. 26:6 is *regel;* see

25. Cf. Emerton; also Michel, 56.
26. See III.2 below.
27. See *KAI,* II, 27 concerning no. 18.7.
28. *HAL,* III, 952.
29. See III.2 below.
30. See III.2 below.
31. See *LexHebAram,* 661.
32. See *HP,* 9ff.
33. See II.1 above.

above), especially since it generally refers to feet in motion (see esp. Jgs. 5:28b, with reference to the "legs"/"hoofbeats" of the chariot, or Cant. 7:2[1], with its reference to the dancing feet of the Shulammite); here the transition to the meaning "step" can occasionally be quite fluid (see, e.g., Ps. 57:7[6]; 140:5[4]; Prov. 29:5, though also Ps. 58:11[10]). Similarly, the literal sense can easily shift into the figurative (see the par. passages 2 K. 19:24 and Isa. 37:25, which speak of the "soles" of King Sennacherib's feet); such is especially the case when anthropomorphic reference is made to God (Ps. 74:3; 85:14[13]), or when the conduct of the believer is mentioned (17:5; 119:133). These 13 passages all exhibit poetic style. When the word was used poetically in the literal, expanded, or figurative sense, it may have been perceived as a rare or even elevated term.

Two other examples of rare usage include a cultic context with a deviating feminine plural form;[34] here the reference is to the "feet" of the ark (Ex. 25:12; 37:3) and of certain stands in the temple (1 K. 7:30).[35] The other example is in Isa. 41:7 with its reference to the tool of a smith; here *pa'am* has traditionally been identified as an "anvil," though the word otherwise never has this meaning and can hardly have it here given the context. Here it parallels the *paṭṭîš*, the smith's "hammer," and probably represents a small hammer or clapper of some sort (cf. Theodotion; Targ. *qurnāsā'*, "mallet/clapper"; also in Ps. 74:3),[36] perhaps one shaped like a foot.[37] Some interpreters propose the possible verbal sense of "strike, hit."[38] The expression *pa'am 'aḥaṯ* in 1 S. 26:8 has also been understood in this sense and translated "with one blow [a second will not be necessary]" (e.g., Zurich Bible). While this interpretation is certainly possible and even comprehensible within the narrower context, semantic findings suggest that except for the poetic passages Jgs. 5:28; 2 K. 19:24 par. Isa. 37:25, and the special plural form in Ex. 25:12; 37:3; 1 K. 7:30, the use of *pa'am* in the Tetrateuch, in the Dtr History, and in the Chronicler's History is always temporal; in that case, within a narrative context such as 1 S. 26:8 the temporal meaning "all of a sudden" is more likely (cf. Luther).[39]

The predominant sense of *pa'am* (101 or 100 [discounting 1 S. 26:8][40] of 118 occurrences) is thus temporal. In OT Hebrew the word functioned primarily in the temporal-adverbial sense, though even so, its use could be quite varied.

In contradistinction to *'ēṯ*, "time,"[41] *pa'am* in the singular refers to a specific point in time.[42] The specificity of that point in time can be expressed by the determination of

---

34. See II.1 above.

35. See, e.g., J. Gray, *I & II Kings. OTL* (²1970), 192, 195.

36. See *WTM*, IV, 276-77.

37. Cf. esp. K. Elliger, *Deuterojesaja (40,1–45,7). BK* XI/1 (1978), 108, 129; *HAL*, III, 952-53.

38. *BDB*, 822; cf. C. R. North, *The Second Isaiah* (Oxford, 1964), 96, who translates *pa'am* as "nailhammer"; also A. Haldar, *The Notion of the Desert in Sumero-Accadian and West-Semitic Religions. UUÅ* (1950:3), 37; *TO*, I, 343 on *KTU* 1.12, I, 40.

39. Cf. otherwise H. J. Stoebe, *Das erste Buch Samuelis. KAT* VIII/1 (1973), 461.

40. Jenni; *HAL*, III, 952.

41. Cf. Jenni, 956, who also debates the issue with J. R. Wilch, *Time and Event* (Leiden, 1969).

42. See Barr, 113-14.

the noun itself, viz., *happa'am,* "this time," "now" (Gen. 29:35; 30:20; 46:30; Ex. 9:27; Jgs. 15:3; 16:18; probably also Gen. 2:23; see comms.; cf. also *hayyôm,* "today," e.g., Gen. 4:14). More often, however, it is qualified by another word or expression, e.g., *'ak̲* (*'ak̲ happa'am,* "[only] this one time yet," Gen. 18:32; Ex. 10:17; Jgs. 6:39; 16:28) or *raq* (*raq happa'am,* "only this one time [yet]," Jgs. 6:39), or through the prep. *bᵉ* and a demonstrative (*bappa'am hazzōʾt̲,* "this time," Ex. 9:14; 2 S. 17:7; Jer. 10:18; 16:21), which in its own turn can be amplified by *gam* ("this time as well," Ex. 8:28[32]; cf. Dt. 9:19; 10:10). Such amplification can also be expressed with a preceding *zeh,* "this" (Gen. 27:36; 43:10; Nu. 14:22; 24:10; Jgs. 16:15; Job 19:3), which may also help explain the cumbersome position of *zeh* in Jgs. 16:28 (*happa'am hazzeh,* "this time [again, yet]").[43] A preceding *'attâ,* "now" (Gen. 29:34; cf. 43:10), can also provide emphasis. Such emphasis helps throw the specific point in time into relief as a special situation. Reduplication of the singular with the comparative particle *kᵉ* can also provide the point of comparison with an earlier situation (*kᵉpa'am bᵉpa'am,* "this time as earlier, i.e., as at earlier times," Nu. 24:1; Jgs. 16:20; 20:30-31; 1 S. 3:10; 20:25). Simple reduplication without the particle expresses a (rapid) alteration of situations (*pa'am . . . pa'am,* "now/sometimes . . . now/sometimes," Prov. 7:12).

The use of *pa'am* in the numerical sense is even more frequent. Such is the case even in several occurrences of the singular (*pa'am 'aḥat̲/'eḥāt̲,* "one time, once," Josh. 6:3,11,14; 10:42; Isa. 66:8; cf. also 2 S. 23:8 par. 1 Ch. 11:11; also 1 S. 26:8; see above; 2 K. 4:35 uses *'aḥat̲* alone in an elliptical sense) and in the dual (*pa'ᵃmayim,* "two times, twice," 9 occurrences; cf. also *pa'am ûšᵉtayim,* "a couple of times, once or twice," Neh. 13:20), as well as in most of the many plural occurrences. Here the pl. *pᵉ'āmîm,* "times," is combined with various numerical words.[44] Noteworthy passages include especially the stipulation of ritual repetition in Priestly texts, e.g., "three times" (Ex. 23:17; 1 K. 9:25; 7:4-5, etc.) or "seven times" (esp. in Leviticus and Numbers, e.g., Lev. 4:6,17; Nu. 19:4). The notion of "three times" also appears in connection with Balaam's blessing of Israel (Nu. 24:10) and God's repeated actions toward human beings (Job 33:29); and both "three times" and "seven times" are used in reference to special actions performed by Elijah (1 K. 17:21; 18:43). The larger numbers ("a hundred times," 2 S. 24:3 par. 1 Ch. 21:3; "a thousand times," Dt. 1:11) appear in connection with the divine increase of the people, and "many times" (Ps. 106:43; differently in Eccl. 7:22) in connection with God's deliverance of the people. The term *pa'am* can also be used in the temporal sense in interrogatives (cf. 1 K. 22:16 par.).

3. *Substantive pa'ᵃmôn.* The subst. *pa'ᵃmôn* is a rare word whose derivation is still unclear.[45] It is a technical word from priestly terminology and refers to the bells on the hem of the high priest's robe.[46]

---

43. Cf. also Emerton.
44. See *HAL,* III, 952b.
45. See II.1 above; *HAL,* III, 953
46. Cf. Kolari, 26-28; cf. also the detailed discussion in Joachim Braun, *Music in Ancient Israel/Palestine: Archaeological, Written, and Comparative Sources* (Eng. trans. 2002).

IV. Theological Considerations. The previous discussion has already disclosed some of the theological characteristics attaching to this word group, especially as regards its use in cultic contexts.[47] The verb and noun *pa'am* do not constitute what we might call a "primary theological term." Their theological significance resides less in the OT understanding of time[48] than in their prominent function within various theological contexts. The verb, e.g., contributes especially to enriching the notion of God's mighty guidance of human affairs and destiny and thus of history itself.[49]

The same applies to several of the passages in which *pa'am* in used figuratively or metaphorically (*hārîmâ pᵉ'āmeḵā*, "lift your steps," Ps. 74:3; *lᵉḏereḵ pᵉ'āmāyw*, "[righteousness] on the path of his steps," 85:14; see *BHS*); such passages are sustained by the certainty of God's sovereignty in history and his righteousness. An indirect witness to the mighty and salvific God can also be found in several of the statements about the God-fearing person who follows the law, since human beings are, after all, completely dependent on God's word and salvation, especially when surrounded by adversaries (17:5; 119:133; cf. also 57:7[6]; 140:5[4]; Prov. 29:5; and Isa. 26:6 in the context of 26:1-6).

The significance of individual points in time or of individual situations comes to expression when *pa'am* is used in the temporal sense. Although such passages can involve implications for the theology of creation (Gen. 2:23), it is especially evident in connection with salvific-historical traditions, e.g., in connection with the patriarchal stories (Gen. 18:32), the exodus (Ex. 8:28[32]; 9:14,27; 10:17), the land conquest and later (see, e.g., Josh. 6; 10:42; Jgs. 6:39; 1 S. 3:10; 2 S. 17:7; 23:8; 1 K. 11:9; 2 K. 13:25). Ps. 106:43 summarizes with the universal assertion, "many times he delivered them" (*pᵉ'āmîm rabbôṯ yaṣṣîlēm;* see also Dt. 9:19; 10:10). Within prophetic proclamation, this usage occurs in both oracles of judgment (e.g., Jer. 10:18; 16:21) and oracles of salvation (e.g., Isa. 66:8). The focus here is on the hour of God's own determinative actions in history, the hour of judgment or the hour of salvific grace.

V. Qumran and LXX. Later Jewish writing continues the OT usage of the verb *p'm* and the noun *pa'am*.[50] Such is also the case in Qumran, where the noun occurs 19 times in its literal, figurative, and temporal senses.[51]

The LXX uses a variety of translations for this group, a situation applying both to the verb, which has as many different renderings as occurrences, and to the noun *pa'am*, which the LXX translates with twenty-six different Greek words. The Gk. *nýn/nyní* is used 7 times, and *kairós* 4 times.[52]

Sæbø

---

47. See III.2-3 above.

48. See Barr.

49. See III.1 above.

50. See, e.g., Jastrow, 1202-3; *HAL*, III, 952.

51. See also K. G. Kuhn, "Nachträge zur *Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten*," *RevQ* 4 (1963) 219, concerning the questionable passage 4QOrd 2:7.

52. See *TDNT*, VI, 626; IX, 586, with reference to the noun *pa'am*.

פָּקַד *pāqaḏ;* **פָּקִיד** *pāqîḏ;* **פִּקָּדוֹן** *piqqāḏôn;* **פִּקּוּדִים** *piqqûḏîm;* **פְּקוּדִים** *p^e^qûḏîm;* **פְּקִדֻת** *p^e^qiḏuṯ;* **פְּקֻדָּה** *p^e^quddâ;* **מִפְקָד** *mipqāḏ*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences. II. Verb in the OT: 1. Checking Presence; 2. Mustering the Army; 3. Census; 4. Taking an Interest in a Person; 5. Condemnation; 6. Commissioning (qal and hiphil); entrusting (hiphil); 7. God's Judgment; 8. Niphal. III. Nouns: 1. *pāqîḏ;* 2. *piqqāḏôn;* 3. *piqqûḏîm;* 4. *p^e^qûḏîm;* 5. *p^e^qiḏuṯ;* 6. *p^e^qôḏ;* 7. *p^e^quddâ;* 8. *mipqāḏ*. IV. 1. LXX; 2. Qumran.

I. 1. *Etymology.* The root *pqd* is attested in all the Semitic languages: Akk. *paqādu,* "entrust, take care of, muster, check, appoint to office, commission";[1] Ugar. *pqd,* "order, command";[2] Phoen. *pqd,* "commission";[3] Egyp. Aram. *pqd,* "order, command"; hophal "be deposited, placed";[4] Nab. *pqdwn,* "responsibility" or "order"(?); Jewish Aram. *p^e^qaḏ,* "keep, preserve"; pael "order, command, commission"; aphel also "give something to someone for safekeeping"; Christian Palestinian Aram. "examine, visit, prescribe"; Syr. *p^e^qaḏ,* "seek, miss, muster"; pael "order, visit";[5] Mand. "entrust"; pael "order, entrust with";[6] Arab. *faqada* I, "not find, lose, miss"; V and VIII, "seek, check, examine, visit"; Eth. *faqada,* "visit, seek, examine";[7] OSA *fqd,* "lose, miss"; also "be distant (from God)."[8]

Although *pqd* seems to be a word with a double meaning in Hebrew, one must assume the presence of a basic meaning that is then construed differently in different

---

pāqaḏ. G. André, *Determining the Destiny: PQD in the OT. CBOT* 16 (1980); H. J. Boecker, *Redeformen des Rechtslebens im AT. WMANT* 14 (²1970); H. P. Fürst, *Die göttliche Heimsuchung: Semasiologische Untersuchung eines biblischen Begriffes* (Rome, 1965); H. S. Gehman, "Ἐπισκέπομαι, ἐπίσκεψις, ἐπίσκοπος, and ἐπισκοπή in the Septuagint in Relation to פקד and Other Hebrew Roots — A Case of Semantic Development Similar to That of Hebrew," *VT* 22 (1972) 197-207; B. Grossfeld, "The Translation of Biblical Hebrew פקד in the Targum, Peshitta, Vulgate and Septuagint," *ZAW* 96 (1984) 83-101; J. B. Van Hooser, "The Meaning of the Hebrew Root פקד in the OT" (diss., Harvard, 1962); D. Kellermann, *Die Priesterschrift von Numeri 1:1 bis 10:10 literarkritisch und traditionsgeschichtlich untersucht. BZAW* 120 (1970); J. Scharbert, "Formgeschichte und Exegese von Ex 34,6f und seinen parallelen," *Bibl* 38 (1957) 130-50; idem, "Das Verbum PQD in der Theologie des ATs," *BZ* 4 (1960) 209-26 = K. Koch, ed., *Um das Prinzip der Vergeltung in Religion und Recht des ATs. WdF* 125 (1972), 278-99; W. Schottroff, "פקד *pqd* to visit," *TLOT,* II, 1018-31; E. A. Speiser, "Census und Ritual Expiation in Mari and Israel," *BASOR* 149 (1958) 17-25, esp. 21.

1. *AHw,* II, 824-26.
2. *WUS,* no. 2257.
3. *KAI* 119.3.
4. *AP* 20.7; *DNSI,* II, 932.
5. *LexSyr,* 588-89.
6. *MdD,* 376-77.
7. *LexLingAeth,* 1360-61.
8. Biella, 407-8; Beeston, 45.

contexts.[9] One such basic meaning might well be "examine closely," whereby the judgment or decision issuing from such examination is included.[10]

2. *Occurrences.* The root occurs 383 times in the MT. Lisowsky enumerates 231 occurrences of the qal, among which Nu. 4:27; Jer. 6:15; 49:8; 50:31 should be repointed as *pᵉquddâ,* and Nu. 1:22 and 4:49b deleted. Moreover, Nu. 26:3 is to be read as qal instead of as *wayᵉḏabbēr.* The niphal occurs 21 times (including cj. in Jer. 6:6), the piel once, hithpael 4 times, hothpaal 5, hiphil 29, and hophal 7. Of the 2 pual occurrences, Ex. 38:21 is actually passive qal, and Isa. 38:10 is generally emended to *pᵉquddâ.* Among the nouns, *pᵉquddâ* occurs most frequently (37 times, including 5 cjs.), then *piqqûḏîm* (24 times, 21 in Ps. 119), *pāqîḏ* (13), *mipqāḏ* (5), *pᵉqûḏîm* (3), *piqqāḏôn* (3), *pᵉqôḏ* (2), and *pᵉqiḏṯ* (1). A concentration of occurrences is found in Nu. 1–4 (81 times), Nu. 26 (20), and Jeremiah (66).

II. Verb in the OT.

1. *Checking Presence.* In several instances *pāqaḏ* means to "check whether someone/something is or is not present," generally with a negative result, whence the meaning "to miss." Saul suspects that someone in his own army has caused the confusion in the Philistine camp, and issues the order: "Call the roll *(pqd)* and see *(r'h)* who has gone from us" (1 S. 14:17). He then finds that "Jonathan and his armor-bearer were not there."

In order to learn of Saul's intentions, David plans to avoid the king's meal, and says to Jonathan: "If your father misses *(pqd)* me at all, then say, 'David earnestly asked leave of me to run to Bethlehem'" (1 S. 20:6). Jonathan agrees, and says, "You will be missed (*pqd* niphal), one will check (*pqd* niphal) your place and find it empty" (v. 18) And indeed, David's absence is discovered (vv. 25,27). David sends servants to Nabal to ask for a gift, having them say, "Your shepherds have been with us, and we did them no harm, and they missed nothing *(lō'-nipqāḏ lāhem)*" (1 S. 25:7), something the shepherds later confirm (v. 15; cf. v. 21). David's father sends him to his brothers with the order: "See how your brothers fare" (i.e., "check to see whether *šālôm* is there"; 1 S. 17:18; cf. v. 22 MT, where he *asks* how they are doing).

Eliphaz says to Job: "You shall know that your tent is safe, you shall inspect *(pqd)* your fold and miss nothing *(lō' teḥᵉṭā')*" (Job 5:24). When someone is missed (*pqd* niphal, 1 K. 20:39), that person is no longer present (*'ênennû,* v. 40). Being absent from or not attending an assembly (niphal, 2 K. 10:19[bis]) is the same as "not coming" (v. 21). After the annihilation of the tribe of Benjamin, Israel assembled in Bethel (Jgs. 21), and upon "calling the roll among the people" (hithpeal, v. 9), they found that the entire tribe of Benjamin was absent (niphal, v. 3); the tribe had been "cut off from Israel" (v. 6). The statement "they [the sheep] shall not be missing" (Jer. 23:4; not in LXX) concludes a play on words in vv. 1-4 (ter *pqd*). The new

9. See D. Cohen, "*Aḍdād* et ambigüité linguistique en Arabe," *Arabica* 8 (1961) 1-29.
10. For other suggestions see *HAL,* III, 955-56; *TLOT,* II, 1018-19.

shepherd will care for the sheep in contrast to the earlier ones, who dispersed the flocks.[11]

The text of Isa. 34:16 is probably corrupt. According to vv. 13ff., wild animals will inhabit Edom's palaces. V. 16 then says that "not one of these shall be missing (*'dr* niphal)." The ensuing *'iššâ r^{e}'ûṯâ lō' pāqāḏû* belongs to v. 15: "the buzzards shall gather, none shall be without its mate" (see *BHS*).

2. *Mustering the Army.* This meaning becomes even more specialized in the numerous passages in which *pāqaḏ* refers to mustering an army. The following points are of interest in this context.

a. First the army is assembled, e.g., Josh. 8:1, "Take all the fighting men with you"; 1 S. 11:7b, "they came out as one"; 1 S. 13:4, "the people were called out (*ṣ'q* niphal) to join Saul"; 1 S. 15:4, "Saul summoned the people (*šm'* piel)"; 2 Ch. 25:5, "Amaziah assembled the people of Judah, and set them by ancestral houses." In 2 S. 24:2 par. 1 Ch. 21:2, envoys travel the country in order to muster the people.

b. It is generally the military leaders themselves who conduct such mustering, e.g., Saul, David, Ben-hadad, Joab, and the leaders Joram, Ahab, and Amaziah. The basic expression "to muster the people" (*pqd 'eṯ-hā'ām,* Josh. 8:10; 2 S. 24:2) can be expanded (1 S. 13:15; 2 S. 18:1) by "Israel" (2 S. 24:4), and "all the people of Israel" (1 K. 20:15b; LXX "every soldier"). The suffix in *wayyipq^{e}ḏēm* (1 S. 11:8; 15:4aβ) refers to a preceding *hā'ām* (v. 7, v. 4aα). In four instances the mustered people are identified by name: Arameans (1 K. 20:26), all of Israel (2 K. 3:6), Levi and Benjamin (1 Ch. 21:6; cf. 2 Ch. 25:5). In 1 K. 20:15a "the young men who serve the district governors" are mustered, perhaps a reference to an elite group.

c. The result is that a number of men are found to be fit for military service, something specified either by a number (1 S. 11:8; 13:15; 1 K. 20:15) or by additional information: "foot soldiers" (1 S. 15:4), "soldiers able to draw the sword" (2 S. 24:9 par. 1 Ch. 21:5), "picked troops fit for war" (2 Ch. 25:5). Such mustering can also coincide with the search for allies (2 K. 3:6; cf. v. 7).

d. Those fit for military service march under a leader in an army or in smaller groups. The battle is described, and after the battle, a new mustering takes place whose result can be that "no one was missed" (*pqd* niphal, Nu. 31:49) or that a number are missing (*pqd* niphal, 2 S. 2:30). The question is then how many have been killed.

Jgs. 20:15 and 17 use the hithpael,[12] since no leader is mentioned. In another passage the Israelites are found to be fit for military service (hothpaal), provisioned and sent out against the Arameans (1 K. 20:27; cf. vv. 15,26). In the only piel passage, Yahweh himself musters an army (Isa. 13:4), who "come from a distant land, from the end of the heavens, . . . to destroy the whole earth" (v. 5).

---

11. André, 151.
12. See H. Yalon, "Hithpā'elformen im Hebräischen," *ZAW* 50 (1932) 217-18.

3. *Census.* The census described in Nu. 1–4[13] uses *pqd* 81 times. The census is to take place in the wilderness of Sinai (1:1). Moses is commanded to "take a census *(nś' rō'š)* of the whole congregation of Israelites, in their clans *(mišpāḥōṯ)*, by their ancestral houses *(bêṯ 'ᵃḇōṯām)*, according to the number of names *(bᵉmispar šēmôṯ)*, every male *(kol-zāḵār)* head by head *(lᵉgulgᵉlōṯām)*; from twenty years old and upward, everyone in Israel able to go to war, you and Aaron shall enroll *(pqd)* them, company by company" (vv. 2-3). One man from each tribe is to help them (vv. 4-16). In the ensuing account (vv. 18-19), the congregation is assembled, registered according to their lineage (*yld* hithpael), and enrolled *(pqd)*. The section encompassing vv. 20-43 lists the number of those enrolled *(pᵉquḏîm)* from each tribe except Levi according to the criteria: (a) their status as descendants of an ancestor, (b) lineage *(tôlᵉḏôṯ)*, (c) families, (d) clans, (e) names, (f) from twenty years old and upward, and (g) fitness for military service (cf. Nu. 14:29; 1 Ch. 23:24). The result is expressed by the formula "*pᵉquḏêhem lᵉmaṭṭēh* [name, number]." The information regarding the first two tribes (Reuben, vv. 20-21; Simeon, vv. 22-23) also includes "head by head, every male," and for Simeon also *pᵉquḏāyw* between (d) and (e); this information transcends the fixed schema and is to be deleted (see *BHS*). In 1:44-46 the result is summarized according to the criteria (c), (f), and (g). Two distinctions appear over against the mustering of an army. First, the mustering is conducted by religious leaders; second, the goal is not battle, but the journey through the wilderness.

The Levites are treated separately in 1:47-53. After the introductory statement, "the Levites, however, were not numbered" (i.e., were not checked concerning their fitness for military service, *pqd* hothpaal), the prohibition follows: "Only the tribe of Levi you shall not enroll *(pqd)*, and you shall not take a census of them *(nś' rō'š)* with the other Israelites" (v. 49), "rather you shall appoint [*pqd* hiphil; see below] the Levites over the tabernacle of the covenant" (v. 50).

Nu. 2 contains regulations concerning the location of the tribes in camp and while marching. The number of enrollees *(pᵉquḏîm)* from each tribe is given along with the sum for each group of three tribes, and finally an overall sum. The Levites, however, were not enrolled (as fit for military service, v. 33).

Nu. 3–4 deals with the Levites. "But you shall appoint (*pqd* qal) Aaron and his descendants to attend to the priesthood" (3:10). An enrollment recalling ch. 1 then begins with v. 15. The regulations concerning the Levites address not only their location in the camp but also their duties (cf. 1 Ch. 23:24). According to Nu. 3:40-43, all the firstborn are to be enrolled and counted and then replaced by the Levites. Ch. 4 then begins with the command, "Take a census *(nś' rō'š)* of the Kohathites," to which *wayyipqōḏ* corresponds within the account (4:34-35). The command regarding the Gershonites (vv. 21-28) is introduced with *nś' rō'š*, but then also uses *tipqōḏ* (v. 23) and *ûpᵉqaḏtem* (v. 27).[14] The actual account of this census, however, is missing. The command regarding the Merarites (vv. 29-33) is formulated at the very outset with *pqd* (vv. 29-30,32),

13. See Kellermann.

14. See Kellermann, 59-60.

though here too the actual account of the census is missing. The overall numbers are then listed formulaically in vv. 36-45. Vv. 46ff. then summarize the enrollment of the Levites: "According to the commandment of Yahweh through Moses they were appointed *(pqd),* each with his task *(p*ᵉ*quddâ)* and his service of carrying" (v. 49).

The form of Nu. 26, which attests this root 20 times, recalls chs. 1–4. The occasion for this census is the plan to apportion land to the various tribes according to their size *(b*ᵉ*mispar šēmôṯ,* v. 53; *l*ᵉ*pî p*ᵉ*quḏāyw,* v. 54). The command to take the census is introduced by *ś*ᵉ*'û 'eṯ-rō'š* (cf. 1:2,49; 4:2,22; Ex. 30:12); although the account of the census is missing, reading *wayyipqōḏ* instead of *way*ᵉ*ḏabbēr* in v. 3 remedies this situation (see *BHS*). Vv. 5-50 list the numbers of those who are enrolled *(p*ᵉ*quḏîm)* (concerning vv. 24,41,50, see *BHS*), and v. 51 provides the sum total. Here too the Levites are treated separately (vv. 57-62).

The purpose of the census in Ex. 30:11-16 is to collect "ransom money" *(kesep kippurîm).* The command is introduced by *tiśśā' 'eṯ-rō'š* (v. 12), and the root *pqd* is used in the distributive formula *lipquḏêhem* (cf. Nu. 26:5-50) "so that no plague *(negep)* may come upon them for being registered" (v. 12). For the assessment of costs for the tabernacle, Ex. 38:21 uses the expression *p*ᵉ*qûḏê hammiškān;* these funds are to be raised from *p*ᵉ*quḏîm* (vv. 25-26; *puqqaḏ* in v. 21 as a qal pass.).

4. *Taking an Interest in a Person.* The verb *pāqaḏ* can also mean to "inquire about someone, be interested in someone, take care of someone." After a long absence, Samson visits his Philistine wife and brings her a kid as a gift (*pāqaḏ 'eṯ-'ištô b*ᵉ, Jgs. 15:1). Although his intention was to renew the relationship, the woman had in the meantime remarried. After having trampled Jezebel, Jehu says, "See to *(piqḏû)* that cursed woman and bury her" (2 K. 9:34), the intention being to thwart the curse (cf. 1 K. 21:23; 2 K. 9:10). A good shepherd is expected to "take care of the flock," i.e., not to scatter them and drive them away (Jer. 23:2; cf. v. 4, niphal); similarly he is expected to look for *(pqd)* the lost sheep, heal the maimed, and nourish the healthy (Zech. 11:16). After the exiles return home, no one will take any interest *(pqd)* in the ark; no one will speak about it *('āmar),* think of it *('ālâ 'al-lēb),* or remember it (Jer. 3:16).

Ezk. 23:21 is difficult. Rarely is a deed or action the object of *pāqaḏ,* and rarely does a change in person take place; moreover, *pqd* is used unexpectedly here in a juridical context. Zimmerli translates, "and you longed for [i.e., were interested in] the immorality of your youth."[15]

Yahweh can also be the subject of *pāqaḏ* in this meaning. The Creator is mindful of human beings *(zāḵar)* and cares for them (Ps. 8:5[Eng. 4]). Job 7:17-18 construes such concern from God negatively, and Job begs, "will you not look away from me?" According to Ps. 65:10(9), God looks after the land *(pqd),* waters it, and thus makes it fertile.

Ex. 4:31 summarizes chs. 3–4: "The people heard that Yahweh had taken an interest *(pqd)* in the Israelites and seen *(r'h)* their misery." This verse actually refers back to

15. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1983), 474.

3:16 (*pāqaḏ* without *rā'â;* but cf. 3:7,9). Being delivered presupposes that Yahweh has taken an interest in them. A similar situation arises in Ruth 1:6, where "Yahweh considering his people" is the presupposition both for "giving them food" and for Naomi's return to Bethlehem.

Joseph's last words allude to the deliverance from Egypt: "God will surely take an interest in you *(pqd)* and bring you up out of this land. . . . When God takes an interest in you, you shall carry up my bones from here" (Gen. 50:24-25). Yahweh promised Abraham a son with Sarah (Gen. 18:10,14 J; 17:16 P), and the fulfillment is described in 21:1: "Yahweh saw to Sarah as he had said . . . Sarah conceived and bore Abraham a son" (v. 2). This whole affair is a matter between God and Abraham; Abraham receives the promise, God sees to Sarah, and Abraham receives a son. By contrast, in 1 S. 1–2 the woman herself is the focus of such interest. Hannah gives birth first to Samuel because Yahweh had remembered her (*zkr,* 1:19-20); Yahweh then takes note of Hannah again, and she bears three more sons (2:21).

5. *Condemnation.* Such interest, however, can also turn to a person's disadvantage. According to 2 S. 3:7, Ishbaal accuses Abner of trying to usurp the throne; in his assuagement discourse,[16] Abner points out his loyalty to the house of Saul and calls the charge (v. 8) a condemnation: "You charge me now with a crime *(pqd 'ālay 'āwōn).*" Job 36:22-23 contains three rhetorical questions: "Who is a teacher like him [God]? Who complains about *(pqd 'al)* his way? Or who can say 'You have done wrong'?" The parallelism in v. 23 shows that the first part of the verse (v. 23a) refers to a condemnation. Because no one can condemn God, he is exalted in his power (v. 22).

6. *Commissioning (qal and hiphil); entrusting (hiphil).* In five passages *pāqaḏ* means "to commission, appoint." The captain of the guard entrusts Joseph with serving (*šrt* piel) the cupbearer and baker (Gen. 40:4; cf. 39:4 with hiphil). According to Dt. 20:9, the officers are to appoint *(pqd)* commanders over the people before the battle. After Gehazi has taken the gifts intended for Elisha, 2 K. 5:24 says *wayyipqōḏ babbayiṯ,* which can mean that he deposited the gifts in the house. Since *pqd* generally has a human object, however, the expression probably means rather that he appointed someone in the house to look after the gifts.[17] In exhorting the nations to take up arms against Babylon, Jeremiah urges them to "appoint a *ṭipsar* ['marshal,' so NRSV] against her" (Jer. 51:27). Isa. 27:3 must be understood similarly; to prevent the thorns and briars from engaging (mercenaries?) against the vineyard, Yahweh guards it night and day.[18]

This meaning is also expressed in the hiphil. In Gen. 41:34 and Est. 2:3, *pqd* is used in the hiphil with *pᵉqiḏîm* as its object. The verb here can be understood as denominative: "appoint as [make into a] *pāqîḏ.*" A *pāqîḏ* is a superior,[19] and hence

16. Boecker, 31-34.
17. André, 119.
18. André, 134; cf. *BHS.*
19. See III.1 below.

even if *pāqîḏ* is not used in the expression, *hipqîḏ* can mean "appoint/place someone over an office." The hophal participle refers to someone who has thus been made a superior (2 K. 12:12 *Q;* 22:5,9; 2 Ch. 34:10,12,17).

We read in seven different passages that the king of Babylon appointed Gedaliah to his office over *(ʿal)* the people who remained in the land of Judah (2 K. 25:22; cf. v. 23; Jer. 40:11), over *(bᵉ)* the land (Jer. 40:7a; 41:2,18), and over the towns of Judah (40:5). Although Gedaliah's title is not mentioned, the king allegedly "committed to him *(hipqîḏ ʾittô)* men, women, and children, those of the poorest of the land" (40:7b), and "the captain of the guard committed to Gedaliah *(hipqîḏ ʾeṯ-gᵉḏalyāhû)* the king's daughters and all the people who were left at Mizpah" (41:10). Potiphar appointed Joseph overseer of *(ʿal)* his house and all his possessions (Gen. 39:4-5 J; cf. 40:4 E, qal). The king of Israel "appointed the captain on whose hand he leaned to have charge of *(ʿal)* the gate" (2 K. 7:17). Joshua issues the order, "set men by *(ʿal)* the mouth of the cave to guard them [the kings hiding there]" (Josh. 10:18). The prophet posts sentinels on the walls of Jerusalem (Isa. 62:6). David appoints capable men over the Reubenites and others "for everything pertaining to God and for the affairs of the king" (1 Ch. 26:32). Solomon gives Jeroboam charge of *(lᵉ)* all the forced labor of the house of Joseph (1 K. 11:28; as master builder? cf. v. 27). Although the Levites were not enrolled and counted,[20] they were entrusted (hiphil) with the care of the tabernacle (Nu. 1:50). Achish, the king of Gath, is asked to send David back to the place "that you have assigned to him" (1 S. 29:4). The niphal has a passive meaning, e.g., in the sense "be appointed overseer" (Neh. 7:1; 12:44); the qal passive participle is also used thus (Nu. 31:14,48; 2 K. 11:15; 2 Ch. 23:14).

Yahweh also appears as the subject of *pāqaḏ* and *hipqîḏ* in this meaning. Moses asks that Yahweh "appoint someone over the congregation" (Nu. 27:16), after which Yahweh orders Moses to appoint Joshua over the congregation (vv. 18ff.). According to 2 Ch. 36:23 and Ezr. 1:2, Yahweh commissions Cyrus *(pāqaḏ ʿālay)* to build him a house in Jerusalem. Jeremiah's calling is described as his appointment over the nations (1:10).

The concluding section of H uses *pqd* hiphil figuratively. According to Lev. 26:16, Yahweh will bring terror, consumption, and fever upon the disobedient, i.e., will appoint these ills ruler over them.

The text of Ps. 109:6 seems to be corrupt. The MT reads: "Appoint a wicked man *(rāšāʿ)* against him [the psalmist's adversary] [as judge], let an accuser stand on his right." Replacing *rāšāʿ* with *yāšār* makes the sentence more comprehensible.

The hiphil also means "entrust, commit to safekeeping." Rehoboam commits the bronze shields to the officers of the guard (1 K. 14:27 par. 2 Ch. 12:10). The officials put Jeremiah's scrolls in safekeeping in the chamber of the secretary Elishama (Jer. 36:20), and Jeremiah himself was committed to the court of the guard (Jer. 37:21). When the Assyrians march against Jerusalem, they store their baggage at Michmash (Isa. 10:28). A trusting psalmist says to Yahweh: "Into your hand I commit my spirit"

---

20. See II.3 above.

(Ps. 31:6[5]). The hophal functions as a passive, referring to that which is committed (*piqqāḏôn,* i.e., deposited) to a person (Lev. 5:23).

7. *God's Judgment.* A large number of texts use *pāqaḏ* to refer to the activity of the divine judge, generally in reference to the judge's decision.[21] Jeremiah particularly favors this usage, employing several formulaic expressions.

a. The expression *hinᵉnî pōqēḏ ʿal/ʾel,* "I pronounce judgment on," is generally used with a personal object in the plural, including the men of Anathoth (Jer. 11:22), false shepherds (23:2b), the false prophet Shemaiah and his descendants (29:32), Egypt and its gods and kings (46:25), the king of Babylon and his land (50:18a). These formulas are preceded by *lāḵēn* (except in 46:25) and the messenger formula and are followed by the specification of punishment: death (11:22-23; 29:32; 46:26), revocation of the shepherding commission (23:3; cf. 50:17,19).

b. The expression *ûpāqaḏtî ʿal,* "I will pronounce judgment on," is a variation of the preceding formula. The people of Israel, accused of sinning *(ḥaṭṭāʾṯ),* are sentenced with a "plague" (*negep,* Ex. 32:34-35). The world is condemned for its evil *(rāʿâ)* and the wicked for their iniquity *(ʿāwōn)* (Isa. 13:11). Egypt, Judah, Edom, Ammon, Moab, and "all those with shaven temples who live in the desert" are charged with being uncircumcised (Jer. 9:24-25[25-26]). The people of God are condemned to die by the sword (15:3; cf. v. 2). The house of David will be devoured by a fire for the fruit of its deeds (21:14). False priests and prophets will be condemned "with their house" (23:34). Jacob's oppressors are condemned (30:20). The king of Judah, his descendants, and their servants will be punished with disasters *(rāʿâ)* for their *ʿāwōn* (36:31), and the Jews in Egypt with sword, famine, and pestilence for the works of their hands (idolatry) (44:13a; cf. v. 8). Babylon and its idols will perish for their crimes against Zion (51:44,47,52; cf. vv. 34ff.). Because of Israel's own bloody crimes, it will lose its royal house (Hos. 1:4); because of its festival days of the Baals, it will lose its lovers (2:15[13]; cf. vv. 8b,9[6b,7]). For their ways and deeds, the priests and people will be punished with famine and childlessness (4:9-10). "On the day of my judgment *(poqdî),*" the altars of Bethel will be destroyed for the transgressions *(pešaʿ)* of Israel (Am. 3:14a). Yahweh will punish with desolation (Zeph. 1:13) the officials and the king's sons in Jerusalem who "dress themselves in foreign attire" (v. 8), all who "fill their master's house with violence and fraud" (v. 9), and all pleasure seekers (v. 12).

c. A third variation is the interrogative: "Shall I not pronounce judgment on them for these things (*haʿal-ʾēlleh lôʾ-ʾepqōḏ* [*bām*]), says Yahweh; and shall I not bring retribution on a nation such as this?" (Jer. 5:9,29; 9:8[9]). Transgressions *(pešaʿ)* and apostasy (5:6), iniquities and sin (*ʿāwōn, ḥaṭṭāʾṯ,* v. 25), and disloyalty in the larger sense (8:18–9:5[6]) have prompted this charge. The punishment is death by wild animals (5:6) or destruction (9:9-10[10-11]).

d. A fourth variation mentions the judge in the third person: *yizkōr ʿᵃwōnām wᵉyipqōḏ ḥaṭṭōʾṯām,* "now he will remember their iniquity and pronounce judgment on

---

21. André, 57-186, 232-55; cf. also Boecker, who does not, however, mention *pqd.*

their sins" (Jer. 14:10; Hos. 8:13; 9:9). Judah will be punished with the sword, famine, and pestilence (Jer. 14:12), Ephraim with a return to Egypt (Hos. 8:13; 9:3).

e. Some texts specify when the judgment is pronounced. The boastful speech of the Assyrian king (Isa. 10:8-14) is interrupted by a pronouncement of judgment; Yahweh will say: "I will pronounce judgment over *('epqōḏ 'al)* the arrogant boasting of the king of Assyria" (v. 12). This statement in the first person interrupts both the form and content of the context and would fit better after *lāḵēn* in v. 16 with the following pronouncement of punishment in vv. 17-19. Three times we read that after seventy years Yahweh will pronounce judgment. Once (Jer. 25:12ff.), the king of Babylon and his people are punished with destruction for their *'āwōn,* and in the other two instances the judgment is acquittal. Yahweh earlier decreed the destruction of Tyre (Isa. 23:8-9), though after seventy years he will pronounce a positive judgment over it (v. 17; the city will once again receive a prostitute's pay, but the profits will belong to Yahweh). Jer. 29:10-14 also focuses on such reestablishment; after seventy years in exile, Yahweh will pronounce a positive judgment over Judah (v. 10) whose result will be a return to Jerusalem and a turn of its fate (v. 14, *šûḇ šᵉḇûṯ;* → שְׁבוּת *šᵉḇûṯ;* so also Zeph. 2:7). The people will be taken to Babylon, where they will remain until Yahweh pronounces a positive judgment on them (Jer. 27:22; cf. 32:5, with reference to Zedekiah; cf. Jer. 34:2-5).[22]

f. This pronouncement of judgment can also be expressed without any specific formulas. According to Jer. 27:8, Yahweh will punish *(pqd 'al)* with the sword, famine, and pestilence every nation that does not subject itself to Nebuchadnezzar. A similar punishment is envisioned for the apostate Jews in Egypt (44:29, *pqd 'al*). Jer. 13:21-22 exhorts Jerusalem not to argue against condemnation: "What will you say when he pronounces judgment on you?" (cf. Job 31:14). In Zeph. 3:7 Yahweh says, "it [Jerusalem] will not lose sight [LXX, Syr. *mē'êneyhā*] of all that I have pronounced upon it [*pqd 'al;* i.e., it will not fail to come about]." Hos. 4:14 offers an acquittal of the exploited women instead of the expected condemnation of the faithless men: "I will not condemn your daughters when they play the whore, nor your daughters-in-law when they commit adultery." In Am. 3:2 the Israelites are condemned for all their transgressions. Hos. 12:3(2) announces Yahweh's indictment against Israel. Israel acted as did their ancestor Jacob (vv. 4-5[3-4]), and the punishment will fit the deed. According to Zech. 10:3, after Yahweh has acquitted (*pqd* + acc.) his flock (Judah), he will condemn the shepherds and male goats *(pqd 'al).* In Jer. 49:19 = 50:44, *ûmî bāḥûr 'ēleyhā* is to be emended with Cornill, Rudolph, and others into *ûmiḇḥar 'êleyhā*: "I will pronounce judgment on their best rams," referring to the princes in Edom and Babylon.

In 1 S. 15:2 the object of *pqd* is, peculiarly, an action: "what Amalek did to Israel." Saul is to execute the curse articulated in Ex. 17:16, and the translation is thus: "I hereby confirm[23] the judgment on Amalek for what he did."

In the apocalypse of Isaiah, the expression *pqd 'al* appears for the first time in 24:21. The host of heaven and the kings of the earth will be condemned and thrown into

22. Concerning Jer. 6:15; 49:8; 50:31, see III.7 below.

23. *GK,* §106i.

prison (in v. 22, *ûmērōḇ yāmîm yippāqēḏû* must be understood as "after a long time they will be acquitted [i.e., released from prison]"). (A discussion of 26:21 follows below.) In 26:14 one notices that the punishment ("the dead do not live") is articulated before the judgment itself. In 27:1 Leviathan is condemned and killed.

Job 31:14 can be mentioned in this context: "What then shall I do when God rises up [as judge]? When he condemns me ['makes inquiry,' *pqd*], what shall I answer him?"

The text of Isa. 26:16 is corrupt. It is best to follow *BHS* in reading *poqdᵉḵā* instead of *pᵉqāḏûḵā*, and *ṣaqnû* instead of *ṣāqûn*: "In the distress of your chastisement, we pour out (prayers) when your chastening is upon them." Job 35:15 is problematic. "His anger" is an improbable subject of *pqd*, though Dhorme translates "his anger punishes nothing," or possibly "condemns nothing." Hölscher translates "does not punish," reading *'ên pōqēḏ*.[24]

g. In laments (Ps. 59; 80; Jer. 15:15-18), *pqd* is used in the petition for Yahweh's intervention. The innocent petitioner in Ps. 59 entreats God: "Rouse yourself, come to my help and see! . . . awake, condemn *(pqd)* all the nations" (vv. 5b,6[4b,5]). Jeremiah also views himself as an innocent person, praying: "Remember me *(zoḵrēnî)*, take up my cause [*poqdēnî*, 'make a decision in my favor'], and bring down retribution for me on my persecutors" (Jer. 15:15). Ps. 80 portrays Israel as a vine, petitioning: "Turn again, O God of hosts, look down from heaven, and see: decide in favor of *(pqd)* this vine" (v. 15[14]); vv. 17b,18(16b,17) then explicate what such intervention means. In Ps. 17, too, an unjustly persecuted person speaks, insisting that "if you try my heart, if you decide *(pqd)* in the night, if you test me, you will find no wickedness in me" (v. 3).

h. In four passages (Ex. 20:5; 34:7; Nu. 14:18; Dt. 5:9), the expression *pōqēḏ 'ᵃwōn 'āḇôṯ 'al-bānîm* appears in connection with Yahweh, who watches over the keeping of the law. The jealous God punishes the sins of the fathers to the third and fourth generations, but is loyal to the thousandth generation of those who keep the commandments. In Ex. 34:7 and Nu. 14:18, the formula "he will clear no one of guilt *(nqh)*" precedes the *pqd* statement.

The expression *pqd 'āwōn 'al* similarly means "condemn, punish" in Isa. 26:21. Ps. 89:31ff.(30ff.) exhibits the form of a casuistic law for the kings of the Davidic dynasty, with the punishment expressed by *pqd bᵉ*: "then I will punish their transgression with the rod and their iniquity with scourges" (v. 33[32]).

8. *Niphal.* The combination of *pqd* niphal with Yahweh as the logical subject is rare. According to Ezk. 38:8, the exiled Israelites will "be mustered" yet again (by Yahweh). Although the niphal form in Isa. 29:6 does follow a context involving war (vv. 2-5), it is construed with an instrumental *bᵉ* ("with thunder and earthquake and great noise," with tempest and flames, etc.): "the judgment will be pronounced by Yahweh of hosts" *(mē'im yhwh ṣᵉḇā'ōṯ tippāqēḏ)*. In Nu. 16:29 Moses defends his authority after the uprising of Korah by insisting "if these people die a natural death, or if the *pᵉquddâ* of all human beings is pronounced upon them [*pqd*, i.e., if they encounter normal human punishment], then Yahweh has not sent me." The earth opens up and swallows the

24. G. Hölscher, *Das Buch Hiob. HAT* I/17 (²1952), in loc.; André, 133, takes a different view.

guilty, demonstrating thus that Moses is indeed Yahweh's emissary (vv. 31-33). The text of Prov. 19:23 is obviously not intact, and the sense must be that no evil will be imposed on those who fear God, i.e., that no disaster will befall them.

The hophal form in Jer. 6:6 can be read as a niphal infinitive, the sense then being that the city is to receive the punishment of hostile attack.

III. Nouns.

1. *pāqîḏ.* A *pāqîḏ* is an "overseer, superior," who has been appointed to an office (cf. hiphil). It can refer to a military officer (2 K. 25:18-19; Jer. 52:24-25). A priest can be the *pāqîḏ nāgîḏ* in the house of God (Jer. 20:1) or the overseer of "the mad prophets" (Jer. 29:26; first-person sg. with *BHS*). The high priest had an overseer who together with the royal secretary collected the temple tax (2 Ch. 24:11). Levites were the overseers of the temple dues (2 Ch. 31:13; cf. niphal in Neh. 12:44). Each of the groups who voluntarily settled in Jerusalem during the time of Nehemiah had a head: an officer (Neh. 11:9), priest (v. 14), Levite (v. 22). A choral leader is also called a *pāqîḏ* (Neh. 12:42). Abimelech's city captain *(śar hā'îr)* is called a *pāqîḏ* ("officer," Jgs. 9:28; cf. v. 30, "ruler"). Joseph advises Pharaoh to appoint overseers for the entire country (*pqd* hiphil) to organize the storing of grain (Gen. 41:34). King Ahasuerus appointed (*pqd* hiphil) officials in all the provinces of his kingdom to assemble beautiful maidens around the king (Est. 2:2-3).

2. *piqqāḏôn.* The term *piqqāḏôn* refers to that over which someone is such a *pāqîḏ.* It refers once to the grain "reserves" Joseph has put aside (Gen. 41:36), then also to goods that have been entrusted as a deposit (Lev. 5:21,23[6:2,4]; cf. *pqd* hophal, v. 23); its relationship to *tᵉśûmeṯ yāḏ* (something loaned?) is unclear.

3. *piqqûḏîm.* The *piqqûḏîm* are the ordinances or precepts Yahweh imposes on his people. In Ps. 119 the word occurs in 19 of 22 strophes (*lᵉḵol-piqqûḏeyḵā* is to be read with LXX in v. 128). The term generally stands at the end of the strophe, while *dᵉḇārîm* and *'imrâ* generally stand at the beginning, though it is difficult to discern any semantic difference. The acrostic Ps. 111 also contains the term (v. 7: "his precepts are trustworthy"). In Ps. 19:9(8) Yahweh's precepts are "right" *(yāšār).* According to Ps. 103:18, Yahweh grants his steadfast love to those "who keep his covenant and remember to do his commandments."

4. *pᵉqûḏîm.* The term *pᵉqûḏîm* refers to something imposed or assigned, e.g., those things designated for the tabernacle (Ex. 38:21 introduces an enumeration of the quantities of metal used; so also probably in Nu. 7:2, where the princes oversee the offering of the stipulated gifts) or the duties Moses assigns to the Levites (Nu. 4:49).[25]

5. *pᵉqiḏuṯ.* Jer. 37:13 (the only occurrence) uses the term *pᵉqiḏuṯ* in the expression *ba'al pᵉqiḏuṯ,* referring to a gatekeeper or guard who arrests Jeremiah.

---

25. See Kellermann, 52.

6. *p*ᵉ*qôḏ*. The term *p*ᵉ*qôḏ* refers in Jer. 50:21 and Ezk. 23:23 to an "Aramaean tribe in eastern Babylonia" (Akk. *puqūdu*).[26]

7. *p*ᵉ*quddâ*. The term *p*ᵉ*quddâ* exhibits several semantic nuances. It can refer to the mustering of soldiers (2 Ch. 17:14; 26:11), or to the task or office of a *pāqîḏ*, e.g., responsibility for the tabernacle and its accoutrements (Nu. 3:36; 4:16; cf. 3:32; 4:27 cj.; 1 Ch. 23:11; 24:3,19; 2 Ch. 24:11). In 1 Ch. 26:30 the term refers to the administration of the land west of the Jordan. The pl. form *p*ᵉ*quddôṯ* seems to refer to several persons charged with various tasks, including gatekeepers or guards (2 K. 11:18; 2 Ch. 23:18; Ezk. 44:11). The meaning of the expression *p*ᵉ*quddôṯ hāʿîr* in Ezk. 9:1 is disputed; suggestions include "overseers of the city," "he who carries out judgment," and "judgment over the city."[27] In Babylon King Zedekiah lived "in the house of the *p*ᵉ*quddâ*," referring probably to a guarded prison (Jer. 52:11). Isa. 60:17 uses *p*ᵉ*quddâ* figuratively in parallel with *nōḡ*ᵉ*śîm*: "I will appoint Peace as your overseer and Righteousness as your taskmaster."

Isa. 15:7 is difficult. O. Kaiser translates: "Therefore the abundance they have gained and what they have laid up [*p*ᵉ*quddâ* as that which one has put down] over the Brook of the Poplars they carry away with them."[28] The corruption in the text probably extends to an even deeper level.[29]

The term *p*ᵉ*quddâ* also refers to the fate set for human beings. The juridical context of Nu. 16:29 (see above) presupposes that "the fate of all human beings" is death. Ps. 109 also exhibits juridical overtones, which is why the translation "his fate — he should receive another" fits better than "another should receive his office" (v. 8). In Isa. 38:10 one should read *p*ᵉ*quddāṯî* instead of pual *puqqaḏtî* and then translate: "I thought in the noontide of my days I must depart, for the rest of my years my fate will be in Sheol."[30] Job 10:12 is to be understood similarly: "You have granted me life and steadfast love, and your determination of my fate has preserved my breath."

The day (or days) of the *p*ᵉ*quddâ* is the time of Yahweh's pronouncement of judgment or of the punishment itself. Isa. 10:3 uses the expression in a reproachful question: "What will you do on the day of calamity, in the calamity that will come from far away?" According to Hos. 9:7, the days of disaster and of requital *(šillum)* have already come (cf. vv. 6,9). According to Mic. 7:4, Yahweh's day of *p*ᵉ*quddâ* has brought confusion (cf. *yôm poqdî*, Ex. 32:34; Jer. 27:22; Am. 3:14). Jeremiah uses the expression "for I will bring disaster on [the people], the year of the *p*ᵉ*quddâ*," in three passages. In the first (11:23) the statement justifies the judgment (*pqd*, v. 22). Jer. 23:12 also focuses on justifying the punishment. The oracle to Moab in ch. 48 makes numerous references to the year of punishment. V. 44 justifies a hostile attack. One indeterminate reference is *ʿēṯ p*ᵉ*quddâ*, the "time of punishment" (6:15 *BHS;* 8:12; 10:15 = 51:18; 46:21; 49:8 cj.; 50:27,31 *BHS*).

---

26. See *HAL*, III, 959.
27. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1983), 222-23.
28. O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 13–39. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1974), 58.
29. See André, 162.
30. André, 167.

8. *mipqāḏ*. The expression *mipqāḏ hā'ām* refers to the mustering of the people or army (2 S. 24:9[8]; 1 Ch. 21:5), a census yielding an overall number. In Ezk. 43:21 *mipqād habbayiṯ* is an assigned or appointed place near the temple where the sin offering is burned, and the *śa'ar hammipqāḏ* in Neh. 3:31 might be the gate through which one enters this place. In 2 Ch. 31:13 *bᵉmipqaḏ* is generally understood to mean "according to the order," though it probably refers to the place assigned by Hezekiah.[31] The *'ēṯ mipqāḏ* in Sir. 32/35:11 refers perhaps to the "fixed time" after which a person should not linger.[32]

IV. 1. *LXX*. The renderings of *pqd* in the LXX reflect its broad semantic scope. The LXX generally translates according to the set pattern inhering in the forms *episkép(t)ein, epískepsis, episkopḗ*. Other frequent renderings include *ekdikeín*, "punish," and *arithmeín*, "count."

The translations of the formulas discussed in II.7 above show how little the LXX contributes to our understanding of *pqd*.[33] The material in (a) is rendered with *episképtein* and *ekdikeín*, in (b) with *epágein*, "bring about," and *entéllesthai*, "order," in (c) only with *episképtein*, and in (d) with *ekdikeín*. Other verbs used to refer to God's judgment include *ephistávai, (ant)apodidónai*, and *mimnḗskesthai* for the qal, *hetoimázein* and *episkopeín* for the niphal. The single occurrence in the piel is translated with *entéllesthai*. 2 Ch. 36:23 translates Yahweh's commissioning of Cyrus with *entéllesthai*, while Ezr. 1:2 uses *episképtein*. Jeremiah's commissioning is translated with *kathistánai*. Military mustering is rendered with *episképtein* or *arithmeín*, a census of the people generally with *episképtein*. The notion of checking whether something is there is rendered with *episképtein* or *entéllesthai*, though in isolated instances also with *ekpēdán, synistánai, kathistánai, paratithénai, ekzēteín*, and *halískein*. Acting to someone's advantage is rendered with *episképtein*, to someone's disadvantage with *epizēteín*, or a circumscription is used. Appointment to an office is generally rendered with *kathistánai*, though also with *epískopos, parakathistánai, didónai, phylássein*, or *embállein*. Compounds with *tithénai* are also used.

The noun *pāqîḏ* is rendered with *epískopos, epistátēs, prostátēs, kathistámenos, kōmárchēs*, and *topárchēs*. The term *piqqāḏôn* is either *parathḗkē* or *phylássein*. For *piqquḏîm* Ps. 19 and Ps. 119 (5 times) use *dikaíōma*, Ps. 119 (16 times) and 103:18 *entolḗ*. The term *pᵉqûḏîm* is translated with *sýntaxis, episkopḗ*, and *episképtein*, and *ba'al pᵉqiḏuṯ* with *par' hṓ katélyen*. The most common translations for *pᵉquddâ* are *epískepsis* and *episkopḗ*, though other translations and paraphrases are also used. The expression *yôm/šᵉnaṯ/'ēṯ pᵉquddâ* is rendered with *episkopḗ, epískepsis*, or *ekdíkēsis*, and once by the verb. The term *mipqāḏ* is either paraphrased or transliterated.

---

31. André, 169, 230.
32. *HAL*, II, 618, suggests that this text is corrupt.
33. Contra Gehman.

2. *Qumran.* The use of *pqd* in the Qumran texts deviates sometimes significantly from biblical usage. The Temple Scroll uses *pqd* twice to mean "appoint to an office" (11QT 57:3, to the kingship; 62:5, as army captain). 1QM 13:10 uses the term figuratively as God appoints the Prince of Light to aid the good. According to 1QH 16:5, he even appointed the place of righteousness. In military contexts *pqd* means "to muster" (1QM 2:15; perhaps 12:4; 19:12), though a new nuance already appears here in that those mustered (or "numbered") are simultaneously members of the community, and are to report at appointed festivals (1QM 2:4); moreover, the angelic host is with them (12:8). The Community Rule stipulates that those seeking admittance are to be examined ("mustered," by a *pāqîḏ*, who stands over "the many," 1QS 6:14, though here *dāraš;* 1QS 6:21; cf. CD 13:11). A new examination takes place each year (1QS 5:24). CD 4:3 presupposes military regulations: they are to be enrolled by name in the camp. A new meaning is given *pqd* when the word asserts that one is to "heed" all of God's precepts *(ḥōq,* 1QS 5:22; 1QSb 3:24).

1QH 14:24 contains an allusion to Ex. 20:5-6: God "pardons those who repent of their sin and visits the iniquity of the wicked." Here *pāqaḏ* is used with a direct object, without *'al,* as in CD 5:15-16, "God punished all their deeds." In addition, *pāqaḏ* and *pᵉquddâ* refer to the final decision at the end of days. The Community Rule teaches that the course of the world stands under the sway of the two spirits "until the time of his *pᵉquddâ*" (1QS 3:18; cf. 4:26). This decision will be to the advantage of the righteous, bringing them peace (4:6), and to the disadvantage of the wicked, bringing them plagues and eternal shame (4:11) or destruction (4:19). 1QH 1:17 probably refers to the same decision (cf. also 1QS 2:6). Several passages in the Damascus Document may also refer to this decision: when God condemns *(pqd)* the land, the wicked will receive their just due (CD 7:10; cf. 19:6), or "he will condemn them to destruction *(kālâ)* by the hand of Belial" (8:2 = 19:4; differently in 1QS 2:6); "that shall be the day when God will condemn" (8:3; 19:15). The Damascus Document also speaks of a "former [earlier] decision" (or a "decision concerning the early ones, i.e., the fathers"), which is associated with Ezk. 9:4 (CD 7:21; 19:10-11).

André

פָּקַח *pāqaḥ*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences (including LXX). II. Secular or Concrete Usage. III. 1. Yahweh's Open Eyes; 2. Yahweh as the Subject of Opening.

---

pāqaḥ. G. Gerleman, "Bemerkungen zur Terminologie der 'Blindheit' im AT," *SEÅ* 41/42 (1976/77) 77-80.

I. 1. *Etymology.* Most of the occurrences of the root *pqḥ,* "to open" (closely related to → פתח *pāṯaḥ*), are found in Biblical Hebrew. Outside the OT, one might adduce *KAI* 193.4 and especially *KAI* 222A.13 (Sefire), where *pqḥ* is also used[1] within the context of opening the eyes. In addition to occurrences in Old South Arabic[2] and Akkadian,[3] the root is found in the later Semitic languages, including Aramaic[4] and Syriac,[5] where it refers to the opening of flowers and thus to the notion of blooming; similarly, the subst. *paqḥā'* is used there in the meaning "flower."

2. *Occurrences (including LXX).* In the OT the root *pqḥ* occurs almost exclusively in the verbal form, including 15 times in the qal (Gen. 21:19; 2 K. 4:35; 6:17,20; 19:16; Job 14:3; 27:19; Ps. 146:8; Prov. 20:13; Isa. 37:17; 42:7,20; Jer. 32:19; Dnl. 9:18 *Q;* Zech. 12:4), 3 times in the niphal (Gen. 3:5,7; Isa. 35:5), and then also as an adjective (Ex. 4:11; 23:8). The expression *p^{e}qaḥ-qôaḥ* is also found in Isa. 61:1. The root does not occur in Hebrew Sirach, and the only occurrence thus far in Qumran is 4QShir^b (4Q511) 16:5 in the expression *pqḥ 'znym,* "to open one's ears." It may be that at a very late date, *ptḥ* replaced *pqḥ.* In any event the root *pqḥ* is used in connection with the noun → עין *'ayin,* apart from Isa. 42:20 (there with *'ōzen;* the situation differs with *ptḥ,* which occurs with *'ayin* only in 1 K. 8:29,52; 2 Ch. 6:20,40; 7:15; Neh. 1:6, and otherwise in other combinations). The LXX occurrences exhibit no peculiarities. The adjective is translated as *blépein,* while the verb is rendered with derivatives of *oígein* (*anoígein* or *dianoígein*). The LXX renders *p^{e}qaḥ-qôaḥ* with *anáblepsis.*

II. Secular or Concrete Usage. In only a few passages is *pqḥ* used in secular or concrete contexts. According to 2 K. 4:35, the Shunammite's dead son opens his eyes again, i.e., returns to life. Both Job 27:19 and Prov. 20:13 refer to opening one's eyes in the morning upon awakening, though the passage from Job is associated with a negative context insofar as the wicked will then see that their wealth is gone. By contrast, Prov. 20:13 advises opening one's eyes early in the morning, probably in order to escape poverty and hunger by working hard.[6]

III. 1. *Yahweh's Open Eyes.* Yahweh's open eyes are addressed within the context of prayers. According to 2 K. 19:16 par. Isa. 37:17, Hezekiah entreats Yahweh to open his eyes that he might see how Sennacherib mocks him (i.e., Yahweh) and then intervene that all may see from Jerusalem's deliverance that Yahweh is Lord. Dnl. 9:18 also asks Yahweh to intervene on Jerusalem's behalf, entreating him to open his eyes (as in 2 K. 19:16 par. Isa. 37:17 in combination with *haṭṭēh 'ozn^{e}ḵā*).

Yahweh's promise to keep a watchful eye when judging the nations with Judah's/Je-

1. See III.1 below.
2. Biella, 408.
3. *AHw,* II, 855.
4. *DNSI,* II, 933-34.
5. *HAL,* III, 959.
6. O. Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos (Proverbia). BK* XVII (1984), 235.

rusalem's help also represents positive assurance for Jerusalem (Zech. 12:4). Such references to "keeping one's eyes open" are clearly an expression of concern and protection.[7]

Jer. 32:19 is a bit more complicated. Yahweh's eyes are "open to all the ways of mortals," and thus does he "reward all according to their ways." This statement may also contain an interpretation of the exile, since Yahweh's open eyes are associated not only with his beneficence but also with his judgment. Job 14:3 focuses only on the element of judgment, viewing God as a prosecutor who brings a person to judgment,[8] and much less as one who "sees what was not seen before."[9]

2. *Yahweh as the Subject of Opening.* Yahweh as the subject of *pqḥ* signals the presence of metaphor. Yahweh is the neutral subject of *pqḥ* in Gen. 3:5,7, and Isa. 35:5. Both Adam's and Eve's eyes are opened after they have eaten the forbidden fruit (Gen. 3:5,7); the result is a qualitatively new way of seeing. In Israel's coming salvific period (Isa. 35:5-6), the eyes of the blind will be opened and other defects healed. Although both Wildberger[10] and Clements[11] think the reference is to concrete physical defects, the ambiguous context certainly allows an interweaving of both concrete and spiritual interpretations in that the renewed ability to see again in the physical sense also makes possible a new spiritual seeing[12] (similarly also Ps. 146:8).

With its comprehensive reference to Israel's fate, Isa. 42:7 is probably also to be understood figuratively with regard to Israel's blindness in the face of its own relationship with God. The Servant of God is sent so that he might open the eyes of the blind; although it is unclear here whether Yahweh or the Servant is the subject, Yahweh does in any event remain the initiator. The adjective exhibits unmistakable metaphorical character in Ex. 23:8 in the warning against taking bribes, since they blind a person. The same applies to Ex. 4:11, where Yahweh counters Moses' objection that he is unable to speak by referring to his, Yahweh's, creative activity with regard to human beings; among other things, Yahweh has enabled them to see rather than leaving them blind. The conjecture suggested by S. T. Lachs (*pissēaḥ* instead of *piqqēaḥ*) is untenable, since the focus is primarily on the sense organ Yahweh has created rather than on its frailty, which Lachs emphasizes in view of the context.[13]

In Gen. 21:19 a concrete object becomes visible when Yahweh opens Hagar's eyes; she sees a well of water from which she can quench her son's thirst. 2 K. 6:17 and 20 contain Elisha's entreaty that Yahweh open the eyes of the servant so that he might see the true nature of the situation. Elisha's servant then sees (v. 17) that Israel is not alone

---

7. A. S. von der Woude, *Zacharia. POT* (1984), in loc.; W. Rudolph, *Haggai — Sacharja 1–8 — Sacharja 9–14 — Maleachi. KAT* XIII/4 (1976), 221.

8. A. Weiser, *Das Buch Hiob. ATD* XIII (1951, [7]1980), 102.

9. N. C. Habel, *Job. OTL* (1985), 240, in analogy to Gen. 3:5,7, and other passages.

10. H. Wildberger, *Jesaja. BK* X/3 (1982), 1362.

11. R. E. Clements, *Isaiah 1–39. NCBC* (1980), 276.

12. Wildberger, *Jesaja,* 1363.

13. Lachs, "Exodus IV 11: Evidence for an Emendation," *VT* 26 (1976) 249-50. Cf. S. Speier, "פקח Ex IV 11," *VT* 10 (1960) 347.

in their battle with the Arameans, but that unexpected "horses and chariots of fire" are coming to their aid. V. 20 then relates how these enemies recognize that they have been tricked and have not paid sufficient attention.

Isa. 42:20 points out that even open ears do not guarantee that a person will hear. This assertion is all the more remarkable in that here it is Yahweh's own servant who does not perceive Yahweh in the correct way.

This survey of texts shows that *pqḥ* is used with *'ayin* and *'ōzen* in an almost exclusively metaphorical sense. The reference is not (primarily) to concrete seeing or hearing, but to a new or different understanding of what is normally seen or heard. The issue is the correct understanding or assessment of a situation, not its simple perception. Only Isa. 61:1 uses *pqḥ* atypically in a different function as a reference to the opening of fetters.

Hausmann

פַּר *par*; פָּרָה *pārâ*

Contents: I. Semitic Languages. II. OT: 1. Occurrences; 2. Meaning. III. OT Usage: 1. Agricultural Contexts: a. Narrative Texts; b. Metaphorical Usage; 2. Sacrificial Contexts: a. Sacrificial Legislation; b. Narrative Texts; c. Criticism of Animal Sacrifice. IV. LXX and Qumran: 1. LXX; 2. Qumran.

I. Semitic Languages. The word *par/pārâ* occurs only rarely in the Semitic languages. Von Soden refers to the Hebrew in listing *parru* II, "lamb, young sheep," and *parratu*, "female lamb."[1] The term is attested in Ugaritic[2] as *pr* II, in a text that O. Eissfeldt understands as an "inventory of young bulls [*prm*] — quantities with price in shekels, e.g., line 2: 'four bulls for 20 [shekels]'";[3] a *prt* is also mentioned once: Puissant Ba'al travels to Mot after having received an invitation, and along the way "desires a heifer in the pasturage, a cow in the field of lions of Memat."[4] The term *pr*

---

par. B. Lincoln, *Warriors and Cattle: A Study in the Ecology of Religions. Hermeneutics* 10 (Berkeley, 1981) (reviewed by W. Thiel, *OLZ* 82 [1987] 241-43); L. Malten, "Der Stier in Kult und mythischem Bild," *Jahrbuch des deutschen archäologischen Instituts* 43 (1928) 90-139; R. Péter-Contesse, "פר et שור: Note de lexicographie hébraïque," *VT* 25 (1975) 486-96; idem, "Note on the Semantic Domains of Two Hebrew Words: פר and שור," *BT* 27 (1976) 119-21; D. Wachsmuth, "'Taurobolium' und 'Tauros,'" *KlPauly*, V (1975), 543-44, 546-47; M. Weippert, "Gott und Stier," *ZDPV* 77 (1961) 93-117; → בקר *bāqār*, II, 209ff.

1. *AHw*, II, 834b.

2. *WUS*, no. 2260; *UT*, nos. 2122, 2125; *KTU* 4.142, 1-2.

3. "The Alphabetical Cuneiform Texts from Ras Shamra Published in PRU II, 1957," *KlSchr*, II (1963), 398.

4. *KTU* 1.5, V, 18. Translation after J. Aistleitner, *Die mythologischen und kultischen Texte aus Ras Schamra* (Budapest, [2]1964), 16; cf. also *ANET*, 139.

occurring in Phoenician and Punic is to be equated with *pᵉrî*.[5] In Jewish Aramaic the Talmud tractate *Parah*, "The Red Heifer," constitutes the primary witness for *par/pārâ* and is of considerable significance for establishing the meaning of the noun.[6] The writings of Qumran and Wadi Murabba'at contain one occurrence each for *par* and *pārâ*.[7]

II. OT.

1. *Occurrences.* The terms *par/pārâ* are related in substance to the word group → בקר *bāqār* and occur over 150 times (131 and 25, respectively) in the OT; the frequent occurrence of these words in the pentateuchal sacrificial regulations is responsible for this high number.

2. *Meaning.* The frequently used complement *ben-bāqār* (Lev. 4:3,14; Nu. 7:15ff.; 8:8; 15:24, etc.; Ezk. 43:19,23,25, etc.) provides little information about the meaning of *par;* although it does indicate that the animal belongs to the category "ox, bovine," it says nothing about the animal's age.

While *GesB* translates *par* as "steer, esp. younger bull (different from *'ēgel*)," *HAL* says, "sometimes the animal is a young one."[8] Only two passages provide any indication of age along with *par*, and even this information is uncertain (Jgs. 6:25; 1 S. 1:24-25). The specification of the term *par* as a "young bull" has been influenced perhaps by the tractate *Parah*, which discusses the age of an ox suitable for sacrifice and of the heifer required for preparing the water of purification (Nu. 19:2ff.; Mish. *Parah* 1:2: "but out of respect, do not bring old animals"). According to R. Péter-Contesse, *par/pārâ* can be understood as a fully grown, i.e., sexually mature, steer (or bull) and cow, while the → עגל *'ēgel/'eglâ* refers to the younger animals. The terms *bāqār* and *šôr* would then allegedly refer to the category "ox, bovine," collectively or as an individual animal without saying anything about age or gender.

He also considers the other possibility, namely, that *šôr*, "bull," and *pārâ*, "cow," belong together, while *par* is to be translated as "young bull."[9] Militating against this view, however, is that the OT never uses *par* = "young bull" to refer to the cultically venerated bull image, but rather *'ēgel* = "calf." We have as yet no persuasive etymological explanation of *par*. Gesenius[10] mentions a root *prr* with the meanings "cito ferri, currere" (cf. in this regard the name of the river near Damascus, *parpar*, mentioned in 2 K. 5:12),[11] or "vehi . . . ut iuvencus dictus sit a vehiculo trahendo," yet also refers to the possibility of understanding *prr* = *prh* in the meaning "fertilis fuit," which would fit with the mythological context mentioned below.[12] In all probability *par* is a primary noun.

---

5. *DNSI*, II, 934-35; *KAI* 14.12; *CIS*, I 166 B, 2.
6. See II.2 below.
7. See III.1a, 1b below.
8. *GesB*, 656; *HAL*, III, 961.
9. See the tables in *VT* 25 (1975) 496; *BT* 27 (1976) 121.
10. *GesTh*, II, 1131; cf. *GesB*, 656, 662.
11. See *GesB*, 661.
12. See III.2a below; cf. also T. Nöldeke, *ZDMG* 40 (1886) 734.

III. OT Usage.

1. *Agricultural Contexts.* a. *Narrative Texts.* As an "important agricultural asset,"[13] the ox is at the same time a valuable possession and thus a suitable gift of reconciliation for Jacob to give his brother Esau (Gen. 32:16[Eng. 15]: forty cows and ten bulls). OT narratives speak more about the female than about the male animals. The pharaoh dreams about seven well-nourished or emaciated cows grazing along the Nile (Gen. 41:2 *et passim*). Job describes the fertilization process that is so undeservedly successful among the herds of the wicked (*rāšā'*; Job 21:10). 1 S. 6 vividly describes the transport of the ark, which the Philistines had captured, back to Judah; two nursing cows (*pārôṯ 'ālôṯ*) "that had never borne a yoke" are hitched to the front of the cart with the ark and pull it to Beth-shemesh according to Yahweh's will, "turning neither to the right nor to the left" even though their maternal instincts are to stay with their calves (vv. 7,10,12). Findings at Wadi Murabba'at include a document from the time of the Second Jewish Revolt that mentions the purchase of a cow (*prh*).[14]

b. *Metaphorical Usage.* The prophets often use the image of the cow and bull metaphorically. The destruction or senseless slaughter of the animal, always also including *pārîm*, vividly evokes the destruction of a state (of Edom in Isa. 34:7; Babylon in Jer. 50:27; Gog in Ezk. 39:18). Hosea compares Israel to a stubborn heifer (4:16, *pārâ sōrērâ*). By contrast, Isa. 11:7 anticipates that in the coming salvific age, "the cow and the bear shall graze, their young shall lie down together."

The use of *par* to refer to the personal enemies of the individual lamenting petitioner takes the term into a more individual sphere (Ps. 22:13[12]),[15] while the opposite is the case in the statement from the "Blessings" of Qumran (1QSb 5:27-29): "May you toss like a young bull and trample the peoples . . . and you shall be as a lion."

Amos's reproach to the upper-class women of Samaria is unbelievably harsh: "Hear this word, you cows of Bashan" (Am. 4:1); the reference to the fertile countryside of Bashan (cf. Dt. 32:14; Mic. 7:14) emphasizes how especially well nourished the animals are.[16]

2. *Sacrificial Contexts.* Rather than examining the entire religio-historical significance of the bull, especially in mythological contexts,[17] I will here discuss only the use of the bull as a sacrificial animal. Such use certainly derives not merely from the fact that "the sacrifice of a bull . . . was naturally more valuable than that of a sheep or goat."[18] Mythological as well as cultic considerations doubtless also played a role. The bull symbolized fertility, and the religions of the ancient Near East associated the bull with heaven, the sun, and rain, all of which in their own turn were of significance for

---

13. *AuS,* VI, 160.

14. R. de Vaux, "Quelques textes hébreux de Murabba'at," *RB* 60 (1953) 270, ll. 3-4.

15. See H. Ringgren, *Psalmen. Urban Taschenbucher* 120 (Stuttgart, 1971), 61.

16. According to G. Dalman, *AuS,* VI, 161, the "Golan cow" also yields considerably more milk than does the normal Arabian cow.

17. See bibliog.

18. P. Thomsen, "Rind," *Reallexikon der Vorgeschichte* (Berlin), XI, 143.

the growth of plants and animals. Special significance was also imputed to the sacrificial blood of the bull.[19] Such sacrificial situations are amply illustrated in various sources.[20]

a. *Sacrificial Legislation.* As a sacrificial animal, the bull appears in OT legislation in association with the rites of priestly consecration, sin offerings, and the high holidays.

Lev. 8:2ff. (cf. Ex. 29:1ff.) describes the installation of Aaron and his sons as priests; here the bull serves as a sin offering[21] (Lev. 8:14; cf. Ex. 29:14), while its blood serves additional purificatory rites (Lev. 8:15; cf. Ex. 29:12). The laying on of hands[22] is also part of this ceremony (Lev. 8:14; Ex. 29:10; cf. Nu. 8:12). Nu. 8:8ff. describes in similar fashion the installation of the Levites, except that here two bulls are offered as sin and burnt offerings (Nu. 8:12). Lev. 4 contains the legal regulations for a sin offering in the case of an inadvertent transgression against the divine commandments. Whether the person at fault is a priest or the entire congregation, a bull must be sacrificed (Lev. 4:1ff.,14ff.; Nu. 15:24), and the same rituals are to be performed as in the purification ritual for installing Aaron and his sons as priests (see above). The ritual on the Day of Atonement (Lev. 16:3-27) was similar; here too, special purificatory power is imputed to the bull's blood (16:14-15,18), though the ritual also includes the transfer of sins to the so-called scapegoat through the laying on of hands, after which the goat is led off into the wilderness (vv. 21-22).

Nu. 28–29 describes in detail the offerings to be made at the various annual feasts. At the beginning of each month (28:11-12), at Passover (vv. 16-17), and at the Feast of Weeks (vv. 26-27), two bulls must be sacrificed. Three festivals require offerings in the fall: on the first day of the seventh month the offering for the New Year Festival (29:1-6; cf. Lev. 23:23-25), on the tenth day of the seventh month the offering for the Day of Atonement (Nu. 29:7-11; cf. Lev. 16; 23:26-32), and on the fifteenth day of the seventh month the offering for the Feast of Booths (Nu. 29:12-39; cf. Lev. 23:33-36), which then lasts for eight days. On its first day thirteen bulls are sacrificed, on each of the following seven days one animal fewer, and on the eighth day only a single bull.

The cultic instructions provided by Ezekiel's "draft constitution" are essentially commensurate with these pentateuchal sacrificial regulations even though the actual number of animals to be sacrificed differs.

At the reconsecration of the sanctuary, a bull and a male goat are sacrificed as sin offerings (cf. Lev. 4:3ff.,14ff.), followed each day for seven days thereafter by a bull and a ram as burnt offerings (Ezk. 43:19-21,22,23-27). By contrast, according to Nu. 7:10-88 the consecration of the tabernacle required each of the twelve tribes to donate a bull, a ram, and a lamb as burnt offerings and two animals as a sacrifice of well-being.

Ezk. 45:18-25 enumerates the following dates and numbers for the festivals: on the first day of the first month (v. 18) a bull for expiating the sanctuary; on the seventh day

---

19. See Malten, 139.
20. See *ANEP,* nos. 364, 607, 673.
21. → חטא *ḥāṭā' (chāṭā'),* IV, 309ff., esp. regarding *ḥaṭṭā'ṯ.*
22. → סמך *sāmaḵ.*

of the first month (v. 20) a bull to atone for sins of ignorance (cf. Lev. 4:4ff.,14ff.); on the fourteenth day of the first month (Ezk. 45:21-24) = Passover, the → נָשִׂיא *nāśî'*, "prince," shall sacrifice a bull as a sin offering, and on the following seven days seven bulls and seven rams as burnt offerings. The same applies to the Feast of Booths (on the fifteenth day of the seventh month, v. 25). The "prince's" offerings at the beginning of each month are enumerated separately, and consist of one bull, one ram, and six lambs (cf. Nu. 28:11: two bulls, one ram, seven lambs; were these numbers reduced perhaps for economic reasons?).

The so-called red heifer *(pārâ 'ªḏummâ)* in Nu. 19:2 is not used directly as a sacrificial animal. It is slaughtered (v. 3), and its blood used to sprinkle toward the front of the tent of meeting (v. 4; cf. Lev. 4:7). The animal itself is then burned (v. 5) and its collected ashes used to prepare the water of cleansing (v. 9). The heifer is to be without blemish *(tᵉmîmâ)*[23] and is not to have borne a yoke (cf. 1 S. 6:7). The rabbinic discussion concerning its acceptable age is found in the Mishnah tractate *Parah* (1:2).[24]

Concerning the heifer's color, G. Dalman notes that "the regulation requiring that a red heifer, . . . whose color probably evoked that of blood, is to be burned as a means of purification, presupposes that the people did indeed have cattle of different colors."[25]

b. *Narrative Texts.* Quite in keeping with the cultic prescriptions articulated in the legal regulations, OT texts recount a number of sacrificial situations in which the offering of a bull plays a role. The ancient narrative of the covenant ceremony at Sinai in Ex. 24 mentions that bulls were sacrificed as offerings of well-being *(šᵉlāmîm)*[26] and their blood sprinkled on the altar (v. 5; cf. Ex. 29:12-13; Lev. 4:18). The seer Balaam orders the Moabite king Balak to deliver seven bulls and seven rams to sacrifice on seven altars in order to receive an oracle from Yahweh (Nu. 23:1-2,4,14,29-30). Gideon sacrifices a bull belonging to his father on the newly erected altar to Yahweh (Jgs. 6:25-26,28; the text is uncertain). Out of joy at the birth of her son Samuel, Hannah sacrifices a (LXX three-year-old) bull as an offering of thanksgiving (1 S. 1:24-25). The cows drawing the Philistine cart with the ark to Judah are burned at Beth-shemesh along with the cart's wood as an offering to Yahweh (1 S. 6:14). For the divine judgment on Carmel, Elijah demands one bull each for himself and his adversaries as sacrificial animals (1 K. 18:23-33).

The Chronicler's History also recounts such sacrificial activities. At the entry of the ark into Jerusalem, seven bulls and seven lambs are offered as sacrifices for the Levites (1 Ch. 15:26), and at Solomon's accession one thousand bulls, rams, and lambs (1 Ch. 29:21). After reestablishing the Jerusalem temple, King Hezekiah makes a sin offering for the royal house, the sanctuary, and people by sacrificing seven bulls, rams, lambs, and male goats for each and dashing the animals' blood against the altar (2 Ch. 29:21; cf. Ex. 29:10ff.; Lev. 4:3ff.,14ff.). The ensuing Passover festival is even extended, and the princes and king slaughter a thousand bulls and large numbers of small livestock

---

23. → תמם *tmm.*
24. See II.2 above.
25. *AuS,* 172; cf. also R. Gradwohl, *Die Farben im AT. BZAW* 83 (1963), 9.
26. → שׁלם *šlm.*

for the people (2 Ch. 30:24). Those who returned from exile with Ezra sacrifice according to the number of Israel's tribes twelve bulls and a number of small livestock as offerings (Ezr. 8:35; cf. Nu. 7:10-88).

Other passages are also revealing. After his rehabilitation, Job orders his friends to make a sin offering of seven bulls and seven rams for speaking inappropriately about his situation (Job 42:8). Abijah of Judah reproaches the kings of the northern kingdom of Israel: "Whoever comes to be consecrated with a young bull or seven rams becomes a priest of what are no gods" (2 Ch. 13:9).

c. *Criticism of Animal Sacrifice.* These laws and narratives are countered by prophetic criticism of bull and other animal sacrifices. Isa. 1:11 rejects these sacrifices because they are not offered sincerely and because such cultic activity does not concur with daily behavior (cf. Isa. 1:15-17; 5:8-24). Ps. 50:9 objects perhaps merely to a magical understanding of such sacrifices.[27] By contrast, Ps. 69:32(31) seems to reject animal sacrifice completely.

The same probably also applies to Hos. 14:3(2), which calls the thanksgiving offering for Yahweh the "bulls of our lips" (*(pārîm śᵉpāṯênû).* The LXX and several subsequent comms. emend to *pᵉrî.*[28] T. Naumann associates this unusual statement with the passages in the Psalms just discussed and identifies it as part of the "postinterpretation" of the original text of Hosea.[29] The Targums support this view in the entreaty, "May the words of our lips be pleasing before you, pleasant as young bulls on the/your altar."[30]

Ps. 51 contains two contrasting statements. V. 19(17) asserts that "the sacrifice acceptable to God is a broken spirit," while vv. 20-21(18-19) hope for the reconstruction of Jerusalem and the reestablishment of the cult in the form stipulated by the law: "Then you will delight in right sacrifices, in burnt offerings and whole burnt offerings; then bulls will be offered on your altar." This statement must doubtless be understood as a later addendum, one that H.-J. Kraus believes plausibly could have been added during the time of the wall reconstruction by Nehemiah.[31]

IV. LXX and Qumran.

1. *LXX.* The LXX generally translates *par* as *móschos,* "young bull," though also as *moschárion, boús* (1 K. 18:23), and *dámalis,* "heifer" (Nu. 7:88). It generally translates *pārâ* as *dámalis,* in isolated instances as *boús.* In Jer. 50:27 the LXX reads *pᵉrî* and translates as *karpós.*

2. *Qumran.* In the Qumran writings the term *par* occurs outside the Temple Scroll only in 1QSb 5:27 (see above). It occurs 23 times in the Temple Scroll and can be reconstructed an additional 19 times according to the OT source texts. The Temple Scroll provides an extremely detailed sacrificial ordinance for the festival cycle in which the

---

27. So H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59* (Eng. trans. 1987), 493.
28. Other suggestions and bibliog. in W. Rudolph, *Hosea. KAT* XIII/1 (1966), in loc.
29. "Strukturen der Nachinterpretation in Hos 4–14" (diss., Halle, 1987).
30. After Rudolph, *Hosea,* 248.
31. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59,* 501, 506. Concerning this problem, see also *AncIsr,* 454-56.

par, as in the OT itself, is mentioned numerous times as a sacrificial animal. Apart from the Passover festival, it is required at all festivals, including as a sabbath offering (11QT 14:1), at the beginning of the month (14:3), as a New Year's offering (14:11,14), at the consecration of priests (15:16; 16:01,02,6,10,14-16), at the Feast of Unleavened Bread (17:13,15), on the festival day of the wave offering (18:3,7), at the Feast of Weeks (18:10), at the Feast of New Wine (20:05) and of the Wood Offering (23:6; 24:7), on the first day of the seventh month (25:4), on the Day of Atonement (25:13,15; 26:7,9; 27:3), and at the Feast of Booths (28:5,8,11; 29:01-011,1). Finally, 11QT 34 describes the temple's sacrificial area and the manner of preparing a *par* offering.

Beyse

פֶּרֶא *pere'*

Contents: I. 1. Occurrences; 2. Meaning; 3. LXX. II. 1. Wild Ass; 2. Metaphors; 3. Wisdom; 4. Religious Considerations.

I. 1. *Occurrences.* Although the MT is generally emended, the hiphil of the root *pr',* which is viewed as a secondary form of the root *prh,* occurs in Hos. 13:15 in the meaning "to bear fruit." The noun *pere'* itself occurs 10 times in the OT. In Jer. 2:24, however, Köhler's emendation of the MT *pere' limmuḏ miḏbār,* "a wild ass *(pere')* [or "a cow *(pārâ)*] used to the wilderness," to *pōr^{e}ṣâ lammiḏbār* should be followed and then associated with the preceding word: "the camel that sets out into the wilderness."[1] For the rest, this word also occurs in Sir. 13:18 and in 1 En. 89:11,16. The noun also occurs in Arabic *(fara'* and *farā')* and Akkadian *(parû).*[2]

Personal names constructed from *pr'* occur in Hebrew (*pir'ām,* Josh. 10:3), Old

---

pere'. F. Altheim, *Die Krise der alten Welt,* I (1943), 27-28; idem, *Gesicht vom Abend und Morgen* (Frankfurt, 1955), 102-3; F. S. Bodenheimer, *Animal Life in Palestine* (Jerusalem, 1935); B. Brentjes, *Die Haustierwerdung im Orient. Neue Brehm-Bücherei* 344 (1965); idem, "Onager und Esel im Alten Orient," *Beiträge zu Geschichte, Kultur und Religion des alten Orients. FS E. Unger* (Baden-Baden, 1971), 131-45; P. Humbert, "En marge du dictionnaire hébraïque," *ZAW* 62 (1950) 199-207; A. E. Knight, *Bible Plants and Animals* (1889), 150-52; L. Köhler, "Beobachtungen am hebräischen und griechischen Text von Jeremia Kap. 1–9," *ZAW* 29 (1909) 1-39, esp. 35-36; idem, "Zebra oder Kuh wird Kamelin," *KlL* (1945) 45-47; idem, "פֶּרֶא = Equus Grevyi Oustalet," *ZAW* 44 (1926) 59-62 = idem, "Das Zebra im AT," *KlL* (1945) 64-70; W. W. Müller, "Altsüdarabische Beiträge zum hebräischen Lexikon," *ZAW* 75 (1963) 304-16; A. Salonen, *Hippologica accadica. AnAcScFen* B 100 (1955) 44-46, 54, 74-75; A. Schott, *Die Vergleiche in den akkadischen Königsinschriften. MVÄG* 30 (1926); A. Wünsche, *Die Bildersprache des ATs* (1906), 70-72.

1. *KlL* (1945) 45-47 = *BHS.*
2. See Salonen, 74-75; *AHw,* II, 837.

South Arabic *(fr')*,[3] and probably also in Ugaritic *(pr(?)y)*.[4] Because *AP* 42.9 with *qṭ' pr'* is "unintelligible,"[5] it is impossible to determine whether it also belongs in this context.

2. *Meaning.* W. T. in der Smitten derives this noun from a root *pr'*, "to be wild, agile."[6] Evidence in the Semitic languages confirms that this word is a primary noun and has always meant "wild ass."

Köhler, however, vehemently contests this view.[7] The terms *pere'* and *'ārôḏ* are used in *parallelismus membrorum* in Job 39:5; Köhler argues that because the Aram. *'ārôḏ* is a hapax legomenon with the meaning "fleeting one" and is thus a reference to the wild ass itself *(equus onager)*, the parallel Heb. *pere'* must refer to something different. He refers to J. J. Hess in suggesting that the word actually means "zebra" *(equus grevyi)*, since in Somali *far'o* refers to the zebra. He then also postulates this meaning for all other passages as well. Humbert offers a detailed counterargument, pointing out that *'ārôḏ* is just as legitimate a Hebrew word as *pere'* itself, and that both words refer to the wild ass, just as *'aryēh* and *lāḇî'* refer to the lion in Gen. 49:9.[8] D. H. Müller argues that *'ārôḏ* means "the bawler," thus also refers to the wild ass, and is to that extent synonymous with *pere'*.[9] The presence of *far'o* in Somali allegedly resulted from this language having adopted the Semitic word to refer to the zebra, which is found in Somalia instead of the wild ass. This evidence essentially decides the argument in favor of the meaning "wild ass," even though various scholars still defend the meaning "zebra."[10]

3. *LXX.* The LXX clearly understands this word to mean a wild ass, since it translates it 4 times as *ónos ágrios* (Job 6:5; 39:5; Isa. 32:14; Jer. 14:6), twice as *ónagros* (Ps. 104:11; Sir. 13:19), and once as *ónos erēmítēs* (Job 11:12). In Job 24:5 it simply uses *ónos*, and it renders the overall sense of Jer. 2:24 and Hos. 8:9 differently in any case. In Gen. 16:12 it translates the expression *pere' 'āḏām* as *ágroikos ánthrōpos.*

II. 1. *Wild Ass.* According to Bodenheimer,[11] two kinds of wild asses could be found in Syria and Transjordan: the Syrian wild ass *(equus hemihippus)* and the onager *(equus onager)*, neither of which is an ancestor of the domesticated ass *(equus asinus)*[12] but both of which can probably be identified with the wild ass of the OT.

---

3. *RES*, 4742; Müller, 313.
4. See *WUS*, no. 2269; *PNU*, 174.
5. *AP*, 144.
6. → חמור *ḥ^amôr (ch^amôr)*, IV, 466-67.
7. *KlL* (1945) 64-70.
8. *ZAW* 62 (1950) 202-6.
9. Dalman, *AuS*, VI, 378, already emphasizes this point.
10. E.g., G. von Rad, *Genesis. OTL* (Eng. trans. ²1972), 194; *KBL*^1/2; A. Weiser, *Das Buch Hiob. ATD* XIII (1951, ⁷1980), 55, 82, 240; G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 157, 220, 222, etc.
11. Bodenheimer, 116.
12. Bodenheimer, 128; Salonen, 45.

These wild asses seem to have been present in the ancient Near East from the earliest times.[13] By ca. 1925 they were almost extinct,[14] and the last herd was seen in northern Syria shortly thereafter.[15] Because of its small size, weakness, and wild temperament, it was not suitable for domestication, and after the introduction of the horse in the ancient Near East, attempts to tame it were quickly abandoned.[16] Thereafter the wild ass appears outside the OT only as the prey of hunters (cf. the portrayals from Kuyunjik, the reliefs from Assyrian palaces, Xenophon's description of the hunt, and the information in Josephus).[17]

The OT relates that the wild ass was at home in the steppe *('ᵃrāḇâ)* and the salt wilderness (*mᵉlēḥâ;* Job 39:6), though also in southern Judah and the area north and especially south of the Dead Sea.[18] It ranged through the mountains (Job 39:8; cf. Jer. 14:6) or the wilderness *(miḏbār)* in its search for scarce food (Job 24:5). It ate grass (Job 6:5) and drank from streams (Ps. 104:11). It brayed (Job 6:5) and was an extremely shy loner (Hos. 8:9). It had to fear the lion (Sir. 13:19) and was well known for its unfettered nature (Job 39:5)[19] and toughness (Jer. 14:6).

2. *Metaphors.* In the OT wild asses are mentioned only in poetic texts, attesting the popularity of comparisons using this particular animal.[20] In general, scholars adduce passages such as Jer. 14:6 and Job 39:5-8 in emphasizing the wild ass's wildness and unrestrained inclination for freedom.[21] Such emphases are then used in interpreting passages such as Gen. 16:12. By contrast, Westermann emphasizes the "jubilant, defiant affirmation of predatory, bedouin life."[22] In view of Job 24:5, perhaps one should focus instead on the wild ass's daily task of "scavenging in the wasteland food for their young" as a metaphor for the animal's meager existence in the wilderness.[23] Despite emphasis on the free-spirited life of the wild ass in Job 39:5-7, v. 8 does indeed also refer to the animal's "meager sustenance,"[24] and 6:5 presupposes that once it found grass to eat, it no longer brayed. Hence the OT metaphor of the wild ass seems also to evoke the notion of a perpetual battle for sustenance and existence. Here one can also refer to the information in G. Jacob,[25] who emphasizes the jealousy of the steppe animal and its frequent battles with others of its species.

One self-evident comparison in the OT calls Ishmael a "wild ass of a man" *(pere'*

---

13. See Altheim and *PW,* VI, 628-31.
14. Bodenheimer, 128.
15. Brentjes, 44.
16. Brentjes, 44-49.
17. Also Knight, 150-51; *AuS,* VI, 77, 325, 342; Altheim, 27-28; Brentjes, 45.
18. Fohrer, *Hiob,* 512.
19. *AuS,* II, 102.
20. See Wünsche.
21. Knight, 152; Michel, *TDNT,* V, 284; → חמור *ḥᵃmôr (chᵃmôr),* IV, 468-69.
22. C. Westermann, *Genesis 12–36* (Eng. trans. 1985), 246.
23. Fohrer, *Hiob,* 372.
24. Ibid., 513.
25. *Altarabisches Beduinenleben* (Berlin, ²1897), 115.

'āḏām),[26] i.e., a person "with his hand against everyone, and everyone's hand against him; and he shall live at odds with all his kin" (Gen. 16:12). T. Nöldeke further explains the allusion already noted above to the wild ass's perpetual struggle with its own kind for survival in the wilderness: "Necessity, not willfulness, prompts this struggle in that the wilderness does not sufficiently provide for its own children, forcing them rather to resort to stealing and violence."[27] In this context, it is significant that in 1 En. 89:11 and 16 the wild ass functions as a metaphor for the Ishmaelites and Midianites, two nomadic peoples.

The other explicit comparison is found in Hos. 8:9, a passage probably also engaging in wordplay with *pere'* and *'eprayim.* In any event, the two entities are contrasted to expose Ephraim's "unnatural" behavior. "The wild ass keeps to itself," and Ephraim should have acted thus as well. Instead it went to Assyria and offered "gifts of love" *('ahāḇîm).* Two ideas are fused here. The first addresses Israel's self-sufficient status, a status that would have guaranteed the security and strength of the people of God (Nu. 23:9; Dt. 33:28).[28] The second involves the appropriate object of Israel's love; for Hosea this object can only be Yahweh, not Assyria (or Ba'al).

The most pertinent Akkadian comparisons of this sort emphasize two characteristics of the wild ass. The most important is its incredible speed.[29] The king's enemies should run from him at such speed, and the forgers of documents should run about outside the city walls at such speed.[30] The other comparison addresses the wild ass's habitat. The most distant refuge of the queen of Arabia fleeing before the Assyrian army is called the region of thirst, i.e., the region where the jenny lives.[31]

3. *Wisdom.* Finally, it is striking that most of the references to the wild ass in the OT are probably associated with the wisdom tradition. Fohrer calls Job 24:5 a "descriptive song" "probably deriving from instructional wisdom."[32] Job 11:12 ("Can a wild ass become a human being") has been called a "proverb"[33] and a "proverbial comparison."[34] The question then arises whether the expression *pere' 'āḏām* from Gen. 16:12 stands behind Job 11:12, a situation then presupposing that Gen. 16:12 itself had in the meantime become a proverbial expression.[35] Similarly, the two examples of unprompted braying from nature, namely, the wild ass and ox (Job 6:5), are correctly identified as wisdom sayings;[36] and the two examples of animals associated with the most extreme distress, namely, the doe and wild ass (Jer. 14:5-6), in all likelihood grew out of the

26. See *GK,* §128k,l.
27. *ZDMG* 40 (1886), 175.
28. → בדד *bāḏāḏ (bādhādh),* I, 473-79.
29. See also *PW,* VI, 628ff.
30. Schott, 96, 99; additional examples in Salonen, 45.
31. Schott, 91.
32. *Hiob,* 1370.
33. Weiser, *Hiob,* 85.
34. F. Horst, *Hiob 1 (1–19). BK* XVI/1 ([4]1983), 171.
35. Concerning *'ayir* in the meaning "jackass, stallion," see Köhler, 56; Humbert, 201-2.
36. Weiser, *Hiob,* 58; Fohrer, *Hiob,* 169.

wisdom tradition. In the same context it is significant that Sir. 13:19 is related to Aesop's fable 299.[37]

4. *Religious Considerations.* The wild ass is associated with Yahweh's actions in only a few passages. It is Yahweh who loosed the bonds of the wild ass so that it might run free (Job 39:5), and Yahweh who "makes springs gush forth in the valleys" so that the wild asses might quench their thirst (Ps. 104:11). Both passages underscore the unfathomable wisdom and infinite greatness of the creator God.

The oracle of threat to Jerusalem in Isa. 32:9-14 exhorts the women of Jerusalem to begin a lament for the dead because the once vibrant city has become the "joy of wild asses" and a "pasture for flocks" (v. 14). Dalman suggests that any city thus described has been "completely destroyed."[38] This description belongs among several similar passages (Isa. 5:17; 7:21-25; 13:21-22; 17:2; 34:11-15; Zeph. 2:14), all of which suggest that not only the city itself but also the entire cultivated area around it has been affected by the divine judgment, has become a steppe and wilderness again, and precisely as such the habitat of animals like the wild ass.

Zobel†

37. G. Sauer, *Jesus Sirach. JSHRZ* III/5 (1981), 538.
38. *AuS,* VI, 260.

פָּרַד *pāraḏ*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences. II. Nonhuman References. III. Human References: 1. Death; 2. Separation of Individuals; 3. Dispersion; 4. Separation of Peoples; 5. Setting Apart. IV. Qumran. V. LXX.

I. 1. *Etymology.* Apart from Hebrew, the root *prd* occurs in Mandaic and Ugaritic as *brd.*[1] E. Lipiński adduces Arab. *barada* for *brd,* albeit with the meaning "to file" or "to freeze."[2] The Arabic term more likely to be related to Heb. *prd* is *farada,* "to withdraw,

pāraḏ. A. Vivian, *I campi lessicali della "separazione" nell'ebraico biblico, di Qumran e della Mishna* (Florence, 1978).

1. *KTU* 1.3, I, 6; in this regard see *CML,* 164; *CML*[2], 143b; *WUS,* no. 574.
2. E. Lipiński, "Banquet en l'honneur de Baal: CTA 3 (V AB), A, 4-22," *UF* 2 (1970), 78-79.

isolate oneself." Cf. also Eth. *tafārada,* "separate," Tigr. *farda,* "align, judge," or *tĕfārada,* "separate as enemies."[3] The term *parādu* II, "isolate oneself,"[4] occurs as a West Semitic loanword in Akkadian, and *pᵉrad,* "isolate oneself, flee," in Syriac.

2. *Occurrences.* The root *prd,* "separate, isolate," occurs only as a verb in the OT. It occurs once each in the qal (Ezk. 1:11), piel (Hos. 4:14), and pual (Est. 3:8), then 4 times in the hithpael (Job 4:11; 41:9[Eng. 17]; Ps. 22:15[14]; 92:10[9]), 12 times in the niphal (Gen. 2:10; 10:5,32; 13:9,11,14; 25:23; Jgs. 4:11; 2 S. 1:23; Neh. 4:13[19]; Prov. 18:1; 19:4), and 7 times in the hiphil (Gen. 30:40; Dt. 32:8; Ruth 1:17; 2 K. 2:11; Prov. 16:28; 17:9; 18:18).[5]

II. Nonhuman References. Six texts use *prd* in contexts not associated with human beings. Gen. 2:10 refers to the division of the river in paradise into four different rivers. The vision in Ezk. 1:1ff. recounts how the wings of the figure separated and were spread out (v. 11).[6] The petitioner in Ps. 22 complains that his bones are out of joint, i.e., have separated from one another (v. 15[14]). According to Gen. 30:40, Jacob separates animals out of Laban's flock and comes thus to possess a large flock of his own.[7] In establishing the act-consequence schema, Eliphaz points out that if the lion lacks prey, "the whelps of the lioness are scattered [disperse]" (Job 4:11). In the second divine discourse in the book of Job, God demonstrates his power by pointing out that the teeth of Leviathan cannot be separated (Job 41:9[17]).

III. Human References.

1. *Death.* The separation of death is expressed with *prd* in two texts. In Ruth 1:17 death itself is the only thing that can separate Ruth and her mother-in-law. 2 S. 1:23 emphasizes that because of the depth of their relationship, not even death could separate Saul and Jonathan.

2. *Separation of Individuals.* In Gen. 13:9,11,14, Abram and Lot separate on friendly terms. 2 K. 2:11 describes the miraculous separation of Elijah and Elisha by a fiery chariot. Jgs. 4:11 is similarly concrete; here Heber separates from the Kenites by moving away. Proverbs addresses the separation of friends, i.e., the destruction of friendship, by poverty (19:4), slander (16:28), and the stirring up of someone's (probably negative) past (17:9). Prov. 18:1 addresses those who separate themselves (from

---

3. See *HAL,* III, 962.
4. *AHw,* II, 827b.
5. Concerning the possible occurrence of the hiphil in Hebrew Sir. 42:9, see G. Sauer, *Jesus Sirach. JSHRZ* III/5 (1981), 609; concerning possible derivatives in the OT, see *HAL,* III, 962-63.
6. On the problems of this passage, see W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), 102-3.
7. Concerning the separating out of animals, see C. Westermann, *Genesis 12–36* (Eng. trans. 1985), 484.

their friends?) or are separated out.[8] According to 18:18, the casting of lots decides arguments and thus separates the powerful (as friends?).

3. *Dispersion.* The root *prd* takes on the sense or is used in the context of "to be dispersed" in Neh. 4:13(19); Est. 3:8; Ps. 92:10(9). Neh. 4:13(19) involves a secular context in which people are widely separated on the wall around Jerusalem. Est. 3:8 describes the peculiar status of the Jews during the time of Persian rule. The people are described as *m^epuzzār* and *m^epōrāḏ,* two participles that are not to be understood as synonymous (even though the LXX translates both as *diesparménon*). The first describes the people's external dispersion, the second their inner disposition, namely, set apart or living in a different way precisely because of that dispersion.[9] Ps. 92:10(9) rejoices that the evildoers will be scattered as Yahweh's enemies.

4. *Separation of Peoples.* The Yahweh oracle in Gen. 25:23 interprets Rebekah's pregnancy. Anticipating the births of Jacob and Esau, the oracle points out that two peoples[10] will be separated and that one will be stronger than the other.[11] God is the subject of *prd* in Dt. 32:8, which describes the apportioning of land to the various nations.[12] The "Most High" divides humankind (given the context, one can add: "into different nations") and assigns them specific areas. V. 9 then points out that Israel occupies a special position.[13] The Table of Nations in Gen. 10:5 and 32 uses *prd* in the sense of "descend, derive from."

5. *Setting apart.* Hos. 4:14 refers to the institution of cult prostitutes. The Israelites separate themselves off with such prostitutes, though nothing is said about the exact nature of such setting apart. Some scholars think the reference is to abandoning the sanctuary precinct; commensurate with Prov. 18:1, they suggest emending the piel to niphal.[14] Nothing suggests doing so, however, and the question remains how we are to understand such "setting oneself apart" with cult prostitutes, whether it refers to the more secular notion ("to go off with") or to separation from fellowship with God or with the congregation (concerning deliberate separation from the congregation, see *Pirqe Abot* 2:4b; Heb. 10:25).

---

8. On the problems attaching to the niphal ptcp., see O. Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos (Proverbia). BK* XVII (1984), 210.

9. Cf. G. Gerleman, *Esther. BK* XXI (²1982), 95; A. Meinhold, *Das Buch Esther. ZBK* 13 (1983), 46.

10. → גוי *gôy,* II, 426ff.

11. J. Scharbert, *Genesis. NEB* (1986), 183; a more detailed analysis of the passage can be found in R. A. Kraft, "A Note on the Oracle of Rebecca (Gen xxv.23)," *JTS* 13 (1962) 318-30.

12. → עליון *'elyôn,* II.3.

13. See G. von Rad, *Deuteronomy. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1966), 196-97; concerning the specific problem of v. 8, see R. Meyer, "Die Bedeutung von Deuteronomium 32,8f. 43 [4Q] für die Auslegung des Moseliedes," *Verbannung und Heimkehr. FS W. Rudolph* (Tübingen, 1961), 197-209.

14. K. Marti, *Das Dodekapropheton. KHC* 13 (1904), 44; similarly also W. Nowack, *Die kleinen Propheten. HKAT* III/4 (²1903), 34.

IV. Qumran. 1QH 7:4,22 offer an analogy to Ps. 22:15(14) in their reference to the disintegration of the body because of sin. In 7:22 it is uncertain whether the single *p* is to be completed as *prd* or as *pṣṣ*. 4QpNah 3:7 speaks about the dispersion or scattering of a congregation or assembly. Both CD 7:12 and 1QM 10:14 involve the separation of peoples. The first passage tells how Ephraim has fallen away from Judah, and the second how Yahweh created both the confusion of tongues (languages) and the scattering of peoples (cf. Gen. 10:5,32). The text of 1QH 25(fr. 5):2,14 is too fragmentary to allow an interpretation.

V. LXX. The LXX uses a variety of translations for *prd* instead of a consistent term. Multiple occurrences include *aphorízesthai* and *(dia)chōrízesthei* for the niphal, *diastéllein* for the hiphil, and *diaskorpízesthai* for the hithpael.

Hausmann

פֶּרֶד *pered*

Contents: I. Occurrences. II. Etymology. III. Zoological Considerations. IV. OT: 1. Royal Mount; 2. Postexilic Beast of Burden.

I. Occurrences. This lexeme occurs 15 times in the OT, including twice (alongside *sûs*) as a collective (1 K. 18:5; Zech. 14:15), 5 times in the singular and 8 times in the plural, in 5 of those instances paralleling *sûsîm* (1 K. 10:25 par. 2 Ch. 9:24; Ezr. 2:66 par. Neh. 7:68; Ezk. 27:14; cf. also Isa. 66:20). The fem. form *pirdâ* occurs 3 times (1 K. 1:33,38,44).

II. Etymology. The noun *prd* meaning "mule" (deduced from the Hebrew) occurs elsewhere only in Ugaritic,[1] including the PN *prd(n)*.[2] Perhaps the Akk. *perdum,* which occurs once alongside "ass," also means "mule."[3]

The word's etymology is uncertain, not least because it does not occur in the other

---

pered. B. Brentjes, *Die Haustierwerdung im Orient. Neue Brehm-Bücherei* 344 (1965), 52-54; G. Cansdale, *All the Animals of the Bible Lands* (Grand Rapids, 1970), 79-80; M. Dahood, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography VIII," *Bibl* 51 (1970) 400; J. Feliks, *The Animal World of the Bible* (Tel Aviv, 1962), 28; idem, "Maultier," *BHHW,* II, 1177; F. Olck, "Esel IV. Maultier," *PW,* VI/1, 655-64.

1. See J. M. Sasson, *RSP,* I, 439, no. 101; and M. Dahood, "Recension: Charles Virolleaud, *Le palais royal d'Ugarit* (Paris, 1965)," *Or* 34 (1965) 484.

2. See *WUS,* no. 2265; *UT,* no. 2098, 2100; *PNU,* 174, 406; M. Dietrich, O. Loretz, and J. Sanmartín, "Zur ugaritischen Lexikographie (XI): Lexikographische Einzelbemerkungen," *UF* 6 (1974) 35, nos. 95, 96.

3. *AHw,* II, 855a, "an equine."

Semitic languages. Hence it may be a loanword (referring to an imported animal), a primary Hebrew noun, or a derivative from the root *prd.* Gesenius adduced Syr. *peraḏ,* "fly away, flee," in associating the word with the animal's swiftness.[4] A derivation from Heb. *pāraḏ,* "separate, set apart," seems more promising. E. Nestle explains *pereḏ* accordingly (adducing the Syriac oppositional pair *prd' — zwg'*) as "the animal that goes about by itself."[5] Still, the identifying characteristic of the mule, namely, its status as a sterile bastard animal, seems better reflected in the traditional Jewish etymology cited by Gesenius and others: "quippe qui non generet et separatus [*nipräḏ*] (caelebs) sit," whence "literally the isolated animal that does not propagate."[6] The reference is then not only to the sexually isolated animal, but also to the taxonomically isolated animal in that it is neither horse nor ass.

III. Zoological Considerations. The mule in this sense is the *equus asinus mulus,* always rendered in the LXX as *hēmíonos.* Such an animal is the offspring of a donkey or jackass and a mare. Unlike the smaller, weaker hinny, which is the offspring of a stallion and a female donkey, it ideally combines the size and strength of a horse with the patience, endurance, and self-sufficiency of the ass.

The mule appears in writings in the ancient Near East since the late 3d millennium, and in graphic evidence since the 2d millennium (e.g., in grave paintings from the Eighteenth Dynasty).[7] The mule was especially popular as a domesticated animal in the northern regions of Mesopotamia and Syria.

Lev. 19:19 specifically prohibits the cross-breeding of animals. Mishnah scholars did allow the use of mules (differently in Tos. *Kil.* 5), but not their breeding (Jer. *Kil.* 8:31c stipulates scourging as the punishment).

IV. OT.

1. *Royal Mount.* Like the horse, the mule was imported to Israel. According to Ezk. 27:14, Tyre obtained these animals from Beth-togarmah (Armenia). The mule first appears in Israel during the time of David, functioning as a royal mount.

David himself owned a she-mule *(pirdâ),* which carried Solomon to the anointing at Gihon (1 K. 1:33,38,44). Each of David's other sons also rode mules (2 S. 13:29), as did Absalom when he got caught by his hair in a tree (2 S. 18:9[ter]). The annual gifts Solomon received from the "kings of the earth" included horses and mules (1 K. 10:25 par. 2 Ch. 9:24). Given this assessment, it is historically a bit puzzling that according to 1 Ch. 12:41(40) (i.e., a postexilic view; the passage is not found in 1 Kings), mules appear alongside donkeys, camels, and oxen as common beasts of burden carrying provisions to Hebron for David. Even 1 K. 18:5 still views horses and mules as particularly valuable livestock.

---

4. *GesTh,* II, 1124.
5. *OLZ* 12 (1909) 51.
6. *WTM,* IV, 100.
7. See *LexÄg,* III, 1249; cf. also Brentjes, 52-53, with an illustration of an Assyrian relief.

2. *Postexilic Beast of Burden.* By contrast, Ps. 32:9 refers to these animals as dumb, unreasonable beasts whose ill temper can be curbed only with a bit and bridle. Mules are more versatile than horses and better suited to the particular circumstances in Israel insofar as they are able to endure higher temperatures and are more sure-footed as beasts of burden in the difficult hill terrain. Thus does the Syrian Naaman want to use mules *(ṣemed-pᵉrāḏîm)* to transport earth out of Israel (2 K. 5:17; cf. Jth. 15:11).

By the postexilic period, the mule had become a normal if not exactly frequent mount and beast of burden. Those returning from the exile (42,360 persons) owned 736 horses, 435 camels, 6,720 asses, but only 245 mules (Ezr. 2:66 par. Neh. 7:68; cf. Jth. 2:17). Zech. 14:15 also mentions these four kinds of animals in the same order; Isa. 66:20 mentions mules alongside dromedaries *(kirkārôṯ)*.

Maibenger†

פָּרָה *pārâ;* פְּרִי *pᵉrî*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences, Textual Considerations; 3. Translations. II. "Fruit" in the Ancient Near East. III. OT: 1. Verbal Forms; 2. Literal Use; 3. Figurative Use. IV. Theological Statements: 1. Concrete Use; 2. Figurative Use. V. Qumran.

I. 1. *Etymology.* Hebrew constructions from the root *prh* correspond both etymologically and semantically to nouns and verbs in the Northwest Semitic languages and dialects as well as in Egyptian and Ethiopic: Aram. *pry, pr'*, "grow, sprout," *pyr,* "fruit, harvest, yield"; Syr. *pᵉrî/pᵉrā'*, "bear fruit, be fruitful," *pe(')rā'*, "fruit," *peryā'*, "descendants"; Ugar., Phoen., Pun. *pr,* "fruit"; Eth. *farya,* "bloom, bear fruit," *fĕrē'*, "fruit"; Tigr. *farā,* "bear fruit, multiply"; Egyp. *pry,* "emerge, go forth," *pr.t,* "fruit, descendants."[1] It is doubtful that this term involves the expansion of a dual-radical Hamito-Semitic root originally referring to sound, e.g., "make a noise," whence then "be present in quantity," and finally "to be fruitful."[2] In any event the Heb. root *prh* (more precisely: *pry*) does exhibit both phonetic and semantic affinity with other roots

---

pārâ. I. Benzinger, *Hebräische Archäologie* (1907), 24-25, 66, 139-45; G. J. Botterweck, *Der Triliterismus im Semitischen. BBB* 3 (1952), 65-66; I. Eitan, "A Contribution to Isaiah Exegesis," *HUCA* 12/13 (1937/39) 55-88; K. Galling, "Baum- und Gartenkultur," *BRL*², 32-34; K. Goldammer, *Die Formenwelt des Religiösen* (Stuttgart, 1960), 71-74; F. Hauck, "καρπός," *TDNT,* III, 614-16; G. Jobes, "Fruit," *Dictionary of Mythology, Folklore, and Symbols* (1962), I, 614; J. Sawyer, "The Place of Folk-Linguistics in Biblical Interpretation," *Proceedings of the Fifth World Congress of Jewish Studies* (Jerusalem, 1969), 109-13; N. Shupak, "Egyptian Idioms in Biblical Wisdom," *Tarbiz* 54 (1985) 475-83; E. Struck, *Bedeutungslehre* (repr. of 2d ed.; Darmstadt, 1972); H. Wünsche, *Die Bildersprache des ATs* (1906), 103-31.

1. *HAL,* III, 963-64, 967-68; *BDB,* 826; Jastrow, 1170, 1225; *WbÄS,* I, 518-25, 530-31.
2. See Botterweck, 65-66.

beginning with *pr* such as *prḥ*, "sprout, bloom," *pr'*, "let one's hair grow," *prṣ*, "break through, spread out," etc.,[3] possibly also with *pō'râ/pu'râ*, "bough, branch." [The original meaning of *pr* is generally held to be "to separate, divide," in which case *pᵉrî* would most likely be the primary noun and *pārâ* denominated — Ringgren.]

2. *Occurrences, Textual Considerations.* In the Hebrew text of the OT, verbal forms of this root occur 29 times (i.e., according to the MT and usual textual interpretation).[4] Two different meanings emerge: "to bear fruit" (qal) and "to multiply, become or make numerous" (qal and hiphil). Since both meanings can easily be subsumed under the common denominator "to be fruitful," there is no need to assume the presence of a homonymous root *pry* (originally *prw*) corresponding to Arab. *wafara*, "to be plentiful."[5] By contrast, the primary meaning of "to emerge, come forth/out" seems to have been preserved in a small number of passages.[6]

The derivative *pᵉrî* from this root occurs in the singular as a collective in the sense of the "totality of the fruit harvest." This collective sense is especially evident in the portrayal of the Fall. Instead of mentioning fruits or some individual fruit, it states rather that one may (or may not, v. 3) eat *mippᵉrî*, "of the fruit" (Gen. 3:2), and that the first human couple ate *mippiryô*, "of its fruit" (v. 6), i.e., of the forbidden tree's fruit.

The lexeme *pᵉrî* occurs 122 times in the MT, though some textual emendations have been suggested. In Isa. 10:12 *pᵉ'ēr*, "splendor," is to be read instead of *pᵉrî*, and in Isa. 27:9 *pārê*, "bulls"; in Hos. 10:1 read *pārāyw*, "his bulls," instead of *piryô*, "his fruit." On the other hand, some scholars suggest following the LXX and Aquila in Jer. 50:27 in changing *pārêhā*, "her bulls," into *piryâ*, "her fruit," and in Hos. 14:3(Eng. 2) *pārîm*, "bulls (of our lips)," into *pᵉrî*, "fruit (of our lips)" (cf. LXX and 1QH 1:29).[7] The suggestion that one understand *pere'* in Hos. 8:9, a term generally understood to mean "wild ass," as a derivative of this root in the sense of "offspring" is misguided.[8] One cannot adduce Akk. *per'u* in support, since it is related to Heb. *prḥ*.

In Hebrew Sirach the verb means "to multiply, beget numerous offspring" (16:2), whereas the noun refers concretely to "tree fruit" (6:22; Greek text 27:6) or in the general sense to a "product": "fruit of the bee" (11:3), i.e., the honey the bee produces. It refers figuratively to a "useful result," e.g., to the "fruits of a person's good sense" (37:22). The admonition concerning the passions illustrates vividly that passion will "devour your leaves and destroy your fruit *(pryk)*, and you will be left like a withered tree" (6:2-4).

Among the Qumran texts, those forms deriving from OT citations should be men-

---

3. *GK*, §30g-l.

4. On Isa 11:1, however, see *BHK;* and on Isa. 45:8 see *BHS;* on the interpretation of *pōrāṯ* in Gen. 49:22, see III.1 below.

5. Contra J. Barth, *Etymologische Studien* (1893), 12-13.

6. See III.1 below.

7. See G. B. Gray, *Critical and Exegetical Comm. on the Book of Isaiah, I–XXXIX. ICC* (1912), 460; *BHK; BHS.*

8. H. S. Nyberg, *Studien zum Hoseabuche. UUÅ* (1935), 6, 64.

tioned first, such as *pᵉrî beṭen,* "fruit of the womb" (1QpHab 6:11; cf. Isa. 13:18), and *šôreš pôreh,* "a fruit-bearing root" (1QH 4:14; cf. Dt. 29:17[18]). In 1QM 7:11 *pry mgbʿwt* is to be read as *pʾry,* "adornment of turbans" (cf. Ex. 39:28).[9] In 1QS 4:7 *prwt zrʿ* is mentioned in connection with a blessed condition of peace and longevity, and the first word can be understood as an infinitive construction or as a late Hebrew plural form; as such, it can be translated as "the increase of descendants" or the "fruits of descendants." Several passages use *pᵉrî* as an allusion to the fruit of the garden of Eden (1QH 8:11,13,20). In view of OT usage,[10] the metaphorical use of the noun in the sense of "speech" should be mentioned: *pry thlh,* "fruit of praise" (1QS 10:9), *pry qwdš,* "sacred fruit" (on the tongue) (1QS 10:23), and *pry śptym,* "fruit of the lips" (1QH 1:28).

3. *Translations.* The LXX prefers to render the verb with *auxánein* or *aúxein,* emphasizing thus the idea of "multiplying" and only rarely the semantic component of "sprouting, germinating" (*blastán,* Isa. 45:8 [app.], *hypsoún,* Gen. 41:52 [app.], nominally *gén[n]ēma,* Isa. 32:12; Sir. 6:19). The term *karpophoreín* or *karpophóros,* "fruit bearing," renders *prḥ* in Hab. 3:17,[11] whereas it renders *pᵉrî* only where the Hebrew word functions as an epexegetical genitive to *ʾereṣ* (Ps. 107:34) or *ʿēṣ* (Ps. 148:9), i.e., where it refers to a "fertile land" or to a "fruit-bearing tree."

The term *pᵉrî* is generally rendered by *karpós,* a word whose semantic scope resembles that of the Hebrew word.[12] Alongside "fruit" as a collective and "individual fruit," it also refers to "product, effect, work, use, yield, profit, harvest." The expression *karpós koilías,* "fruit of the womb" (Lk. 1:42), however, must be viewed as a Hebraism (cf. Gen. 30:2; Ps. 132:11).[13] Elsewhere plant fruit is rendered by *génnēma,* "yield" (Dt. 28:4,11,18, etc.), and human or animal offspring by *ékgonos,* "offspring" (Dt. 28:11). In one instance the semantic rendering *tékna,* "children," is used (Isa. 13:18).

The Vulg. reflects the verb's dual meaning, rendering *germinare* (Isa. 45:8), *ascendere* (Isa. 11:1) alongside *fertilis* (Isa. 32:12), *fructiferus* (Ps. 107:34). It generally translates the noun as *fructus,* "fruit, yield, consumption, profit, result, reward, success"; less frequently, *pᵉrî* in the sense of "field fruit" is rendered by *fruges* (Dt. 26:2,10, etc.). The expression *pᵉrî beṭen,* "descendants," is rendered as *fructus ventris* (Dt. 7:13, *et passim*), though the *pᵉrî* of a poisonous snake becomes *semen* (Isa. 14:29).

II. "Fruit" in the Ancient Near East. From the perspective of the goal, fruit appears as the conclusion to the miraculous development of plants. Moreover, it also bears the seed from which the new life of the same kind of plant is able to emerge. Many fruits of trees and of the earth function as sustenance for human beings; others provide poison to be feared. As such, the fruit becomes the bearer of mysterious powers and the symbol of perpetually renewed life. The reverential admiration it evokes

---

9. Concerning 1QH 2:26; 3:27 → פרר *prr.*
10. See III.3 below.
11. But cf. *BHS.*
12. Struck, 41, 46-47.
13. S. C. Schirlitz, *Grundzüge der neutestamentlichen Gräcität* (1861), 33.

comes to expression in the cult and in myths. Human beings petition the deity to grant a blessed and rich yield of fruit, or try to prompt such yield themselves through the use of magical ritual. Legends tell of beneficent or destructive fruits known to the ancestors during ancient times. Certain plants are viewed as established by a deity. This powerful matrix of associations takes the concept of "fruit" beyond the concrete referent and generates a secondary sense of "yield, energy, consequence, success, profit, etc.," that quite frequently acquires lexical constancy in its own right in the various languages.

The Akk. *inbu* is related etymologically to Heb. *'ēnāḇ,* "cluster, bunch of grapes" (possibly also with *'ēḇ,* "fruit," Cant. 6:11; Job 8:12) and refers, often as a collective, to plant fruits (of the vine, the olive tree, the pomegranate tree, though also of the cedar) and to fruits of the field and garden.[14] In reference to human beings, it refers to the "fruit of the womb" or "descendants." It functions as a metonym for the fruit-bearing tree, and as a metaphor for the sexual attraction and energy between man and woman. Mesopotamian texts repeatedly mention the cultivation of fruit gardens, including in honor of a deity, and the regular presentation of fruit offerings. In connection with fruits in myths, one need mention only the Sumerian paradise narrative of Enki and Ninhursag and the luxuriant, miraculous garden in the Gilgamesh Epic.[15]

In Egyptian, *pr.t* actually means "that which has gone forth, emerged," the fruit of a tree or plant, though also seed corn. Hence the word also refers to the season in which seeds "come forth" or germinate. In reference to human beings, it stands for "descendants"; the king is *pr.t* of the divine father. In verbal forms *(pry),* the root is used in the compound "that which comes forth from the body," i.e., the "fruit of the body," and metaphorically "that which comes forth from a person's mouth," namely, speech. Finally, *pr.t* can also refer to the emergence of a god in a processional festival.

III. OT.

1. *Verbal Forms.* In Biblical Hebrew the etymological relationship between the verb *pārâ* and the noun *pᵉrî* can be understood only from the perspective of semantic development. From the original meaning of the verbal root "break forth, sprout," the nominal construction *pᵉrî,* "fruit," developed, which in its own turn then generated denominative verbal forms meaning "to be fruit bearing, fertile."[16]

The original meaning is preserved in only a few passages. The prophecy of messianic peace in Isa. 11 reads: "A shoot shall come out from the stump of Jesse, and a branch *yipreh* from his roots." Hasty association with the noun prompted some scholars to translate or explain the Hebrew form as "to bear fruit" (Luther). Because this notion is hardly appropriate to the image of a tree stump or roots, many interpreters prefer an emendation (cf. *BHK*). Such textual emendation is superfluous, however, if one focuses on the basic meaning just mentioned, a meaning also supported by the parallel verb *yāṣā':* "a branch emerges/arises *(yipreh)* from the root" (similarly also LXX, Vulg.).

---

14. *AHw,* I, 381-82; *CAD,* VII, 144-47.
15. *ANET,* 39-40, 89.
16. Eitan, 59.

This basic meaning is also behind Yahweh's blessing in Isa. 45:8, regardless of whether one keeps the plural form of the MT (in which case the subject is "salvation and righteousness"[17]) or prefers the singular: *wᵉyipreh,* "salvation will spring up" (cf. LXX, Vulg., Theodotion; 1QIsaᵃ confirms the singular form, albeit constructed from the root *prḥ*). Dt. 29:17(18) can be explained similarly, though this involves making the qal transitive:[18] "a root sprouting *(pōreh)* poisonous and bitter growth."

The denominative meaning "to be plentiful with fruit" or "to have proven to be fruitful" is found in the qal feminine participle. The *pōrîyâ* is the olive tree (Isa. 17:6)[19] as well as the grapevine (Isa. 32:12) that, once planted by the water, becomes full of branches (Ezk. 19:10); the mother of a family with many children is like such a plant (Ps. 128:3). This participial form can represent the entire syntagma as an ellipsis, i.e., can refer to "the fruitful/fertile one" instead of "the fruitful olive tree" (Isa. 17:6) and "fruitful bough" (Gen. 49:22).

Scholars generally agree that this participle is also the basis of the form *pōrāṯ* (Gen. 49:22).[20] On this view Joseph would be addressed as the "son of the fruitful one," i.e., as the branch of a fruitful vine, or as a fruitful branch. Others have read *prt* as *pᵉrāṯ* and understood it as an allusion to the geographical name Ephraim, Ephrath, the form then being a reference to "fertile land."[21] Since most of the metaphors in the blessing of Jacob are taken from the world of animals rather than that of plants, however, one might explain *prt* as "bullock"[22] or "wild female ass" (fem. form of *pere'*).[23] On this view Joseph would receive a designation ("Son of a Young Cow" or "Son of a Wild Ass") that resonates in Dt. 33:17. The midrash plays off both possibilities in its own assertion that Joseph attained high office and honors because he was able to interpret the one dream image of *pārôṯ,* "cows," as well as the other of *pērôṯ,* "fruits" (i.e., ears of grain) (Gen. Rab. on 41:25-27).

In the remaining passages, the verb means "multiply, have many descendants," and is contextually contiguous with forms of the root *'ṣm,* "be/become mighty" (Ps. 105:24), *šrṣ,* "swarm, teem" (Ex. 1:7), *ml',* "fill up something" (Gen. 9:1, *et passim*), and especially *rbh,* "be plentiful" (Gen. 9:1, *et passim*). The combination of *prh* and *rbh* in the imperative ("be fruitful and multiply"), directed either to animals (8:17) or, more frequently, to human beings, appears especially frequently in P (1:22,28; 9:1,7; 35:11; 47:27, etc.). This expression might reflect an ancient blessing formula intended to insure the fertility of a young couple (cf. 28:2-3); the redundant combination was then also incorporated into texts speaking of plentiful descendants and a growing population, and

---

17. So Kimchi and A. B. Ehrlich, *Mikra ki-pheschuto,* III (1901), 106, though this necessitates taking the subject from the par. verb and reading against the accentuation.
18. Cf. Rashi: *mapreh,* i.e., causative.
19. On the text see *BHS.*
20. *GK,* §80g; *BLe,* §69v.
21. J. Wellhausen, *Composition des Hexateuchs* (1889), 322.
22. A. Jeremias, *The OT in the Light of the Ancient East,* 2 vols. (Eng. trans. 1911), II, 81.
23. E. A. Speiser, *Genesis. AB* 1 (1964), 367-68.

the condition itself understood as the fulfillment of an earlier blessing or as future good fortune.[24]

The secondary sense "to spread out" (so Tgs.) emerges clearly from the context in two passages using *prh* without the stereotypical synonymous root *rbh*. Isaac justifies the well name *rᵉḥōḇôṯ*, "widen," by explaining: "Now Yahweh has made room for us, and we shall spread out *(pārînû)* in the land" (Gen. 26:22). In the epilogue to the Covenant Code, God promises his people gradually to drive out Canaan's hostile inhabitants "until you have spread out *(tipreh)* and possess the land" (Ex. 23:30).

Since fruitfulness is viewed as a blessing sent by God,[25] the hiphil form "to make fruitful, plentiful," always has God as its subject, who either promises or grants such blessing to the individual or people (Gen. 17:6,20; Lev. 26:9; Ps. 105:24) or is petitioned to do so.

The hiphil form *hiprant*, "he granted me fruitfulness, made me fruitful," a term possibly aramaized as *'ap* with *'ālep*,[26] became a popular etymological explanation for the name Ephraim (Gen. 41:52).

2. *Literal Use.* Passages in which *pᵉrî* is used to refer to an actual plant must be viewed as literal references. Nonetheless, given the particular literary character of the OT, several such passages describe this plant not as a concrete object but as a metaphor for the development, growth, and demise of a person or people. Lexical and semantic analysis, however, must for the moment ignore this stylistic aspect.

The noun *pᵉrî* referred originally to "that which comes forth, is brought forth, produced," and in the OT refers concretely to the product of every "fruit of the ground" containing the seed of further growth (Gen. 1:29; 4:3). Accordingly, a region with vegetation is called *'ereṣ pᵉrî*, "fruitful land" (Ps. 107:34), in contrast to the desolate salt wilderness. The term *pᵉrî* refers especially to edible fruit. Human beings sow fields and plant gardens in order to receive *pᵉrî* as the yield (*tᵉḇû'â*, Ps. 107:37), just as they cultivate livestock for milk (Dt. 7:13; Ezk. 25:4). In the broader sense, *pᵉrî hā'ᵃḏāmâ*, "fruit of the ground," includes grain as well as wine and olive oil (Dt. 28:51), and can accordingly function as an anticipatory apposition for the comprehensive term *yᵉgîa'*, "the fruit of (your) labors" (Dt. 28:33). As a comprehensive term in its own right, *pᵉrî* can refer to the overall produce of a land, especially of Israel. The land yields its fruit so that people can eat their fill (Lev. 25:19); it is the land's blessing (*ṭûḇ*, Neh. 9:36; Jer. 2:7) and its inhabitants' pride and glory (Isa. 4:2). The semantic scope narrows where *pᵉrî*, as is frequently the case, is used in the sense of "fruit of the tree" as opposed to the plant produce of the fields (Ex. 10:15), or in a reverse fashion the syntagma mentioned earlier, *pᵉrî hā'ᵃḏāmâ* is used to refer to "fruit of the earth/ground" in contrast to tree fruit (Jer. 7:20; Mal. 3:11). This latter usage is rare, however, and derives from the indefinite semantic character of the determinative *'ᵃḏāmâ* (or of the synonym *'ereṣ*),

24. See IV.1 below.
25. See IV.1 below.
26. Sawyer, 111.

which is understood here in the narrower sense as the "ground" whose fruit is the vegetable. On the other hand, *ʾaḏāmâ* and *ʾereṣ* refer to a "region," in which case the syntagma *pᵉrî ʾaḏāmâ* can include tree fruits (Dt. 26:2) or even refer to the latter exclusively in contrast to the vegetables of the field (Ps. 105:35). Ex. 10:15, to which Ps. 105:35 alludes, reads unequivocally *pᵉrî hāʿēṣ,* "fruit of the trees," and this specialized meaning eventually became the most common, the notion being that the tree yields fruit, the field the harvest (Lev. 27:30; Ezk. 34:27; 36:30; Zech. 8:12). The spies sent out to reconnoiter the land of Canaan and to bring back some of its *pᵉrî* eventually return with a cluster of grapes, pomegranates, and figs: "It flows with milk and honey, and this is its *pᵉrî*" (Nu. 13:20,24-27).

The Priestly creation story succinctly summarizes the miracle of propagation by pointing out how every tree produces the fruit containing the seed from which once again the same kind of tree can develop (Gen. 1:11-12). Although the fruits of the cedar (Ezk. 17:9,23) and cypress (Hos. 14:9[8]) are included in such designations, *pᵉrî* refers especially to edible fruits (Gen. 1:29; Lev. 19:23; Ezk. 47:12). The more advanced cultural stage of sedentary life the Israelites attained included the organized use of wild tree fruits (Lev. 26:4) and planned fruit gardens (Eccl. 2:5; Jer. 29:5,28; Am. 9:14; cf. Gen. 3:2). Such trees require cultivation (Lev. 19:23-25) and guards to protect their fruits (Cant. 8:11-12). The grapevine and its fruit are mentioned frequently (2 K. 19:29 par. Isa. 37:30; 65:21; Ezk. 17:8-9; 19:12,14; Hos. 10:1, etc.), as is the olive tree (Jer. 11:16), the fig tree (Prov. 27:18; Joel 2:22), the apple and pomegranate trees (Cant. 2:3; 4:13) along with their fruits. We are told that *pᵉrî* tastes sweet (Cant. 2:3), and provides products such as wine and fine oil (Neh. 10:38,40[37,39]; Joel 2:22).

Fruit together with leaves (Ps. 1:3; Sir. 6:3) and branches (Ezk. 36:8) are part of the image of the healthy tree whose roots have spread far out (2 K. 19:30; Jer. 17:8). The destruction of such a tree begins with the withering of its root and ends with the drying of the foliage and its failure to produce fruit (Ps. 1:3; Hos. 9:16; Am. 2:9; Sir. 6:3). The merism in these and similar passages evokes the entire tree by mentioning merely its roots on the one hand and its fruit on the other; a stylistic parallel to this device appears in a Phoenician inscription: "they are to possess neither a root below nor fruit above."[27]

3. *Figurative Use.* Several passages refer to animal and, frequently, human offspring as *pᵉrî,* generally with the modifier *beṭen,* "body, belly, womb," hence "fruit of the body/womb." Although the language here quite unaffectedly preserves a primitive analogous understanding of the biological process among plants and other living things, within the framework of biblical usage this expression must be understood metaphorically, since only in rare instances does the expression "fruit of the body" refer to the child developing in its mother's womb; more often, it simply refers to descendants or offspring as such, and focuses on the patriarchal lineage.

Jacob, however, is definitely referring to the fruit of Rachel's womb in Gen. 30:2 when he tells his infertile wife that perhaps God himself has withheld *pᵉrî beṭen* from

---

27. *KAI* 14.11-12.

her. The lamentation on women who in extreme distress are forced to eat their own *p^erî* also refers to the "fruit" to which such mothers have given birth, or, as the parallel syntagma states, the "children of their tender care" (Lam. 2:20). Exegetes generally agree that the portrayal of the atrocities of war and of the merciless slaughter of the *p^erî beṭen* in Isa. 13:18 might already refer in a general sense to "children," especially in view of the parallel *bānîm,* "sons." The reference may, however, be to the atrocity frequently mentioned in the ancient Near East whereby soldiers slit open the bodies of pregnant women (Am. 1:13) to destroy the life of the unborn (cf. Jerome's comm.). In that case, the word would still be used on the semantic level discussed to this point. The parenesis in Dt. 7:13; 28:4,18,53, etc., which speaks of "your *p^erî beṭen,*" is directed to adult Israelites, man and woman, or perhaps only to the person responsible for the clan, namely, the man, focusing naturally on him also as the father. In such cases "fruit of the womb" refers simply to offspring and descendants. The overly zealous man who wants to offer his offspring, indeed, his firstborn, as an atoning sacrifice for his transgression calls it the "*p^erî* of my body" (Mic. 6:7). The psalmist considers that man fortunate to whom Yahweh has granted sons, for "the *p^erî* of the body is a reward" (Ps. 127:3). Here it is explicitly the man (*geḇer,* v. 5) who is addressed; the Sumerian song of Nidaba, which resembles this psalm, speaks by contrast of maternal love and of "the fruit in the womb."[28] In Yahweh's promise to David, "from the fruit of your body I will set on your throne" (Ps. 132:11), this "fruit of the body" refers to later — even much later — descendants. The word is used similarly in the salvific assurance to the Judean king that he will destroy both the *p^erî* and the seed of his enemies (21:11[10]).

A higher degree of abstraction is reached when *p^erî* is used together with other terms to refer to speech, thoughts, actions, etc., i.e., where their manifestation, actions, and consequence are viewed as their *p^erî,* which may be beneficent or ruinous. Such usage appears especially in wisdom writings. Three similar proverbs function as variations on a basic theme (Prov. 12:14; 13:2; 18:20), teaching that a person must eat and be sated "from the fruit of the mouth," i.e., probably that people end up partaking of both the good and bad consequences of their own words. The continuation in the third version even attributes power over life and death to human speech, so that "those who treat it kindly will eat its fruits" (18:21).[29]

The parallel Egyptian expression to "fruit of the mouth" is of interest in this context. The expression *pry m rȝ* means lit. "that which comes out of the mouth," namely, speech (cf. *môṣāʾ peh,* Dt. 8:3). Given the linguistic similarity, the Hebrew expression "*p^erî* of the mouth" also seems to be meant not metaphorically as a reference to "fruit," but deverbally to "that which comes forth from the mouth."[30] Nonetheless, when the reference is to speech, thoughts, and actions, the contiguous relationship between this word and verbs for "eating," "satisfying," and nouns for "yield, produce," shows that here the word remains associated with the notion of fruit.

---

28. *SAHG,* 66-67.
29. See W. Bühlmann, *Vom rechten Reden und Schweigen. OBO* 12 (1976), 306-12.
30. Shupak, 481-82.

The consequences of a person's actions (Isa. 3:10; Jer. 17:10; Mic. 7:13), conduct (Prov. 1:31), thoughts (Jer. 6:19), etc. (Isa. 10:12; Hos. 10:13), are frequently called *pᵉrî*.[31] Fruit symbolizes that for which a person has labored, the yield of that labor. The industrious housewife plants a vineyard with that which she has earned ("with the fruit of her hands," Prov. 31:16). Personified wisdom extols its own *pᵉrî* as more valuable than the most precious gold; its discourse and instruction guarantee success to anyone who follows them (Prov. 8:19). Regrettably, the wicked sometimes produce *pᵉrî* and are successful (Jer. 12:2), even though *pᵉrî* is actually intended as the reward of the righteous (Ps. 58:12[11]).

IV. Theological Statements.

1. *Concrete Use.* Commensurate with its basic affirmation of the here and now, the OT views the continuation of life, its progress, its increase to be the result and visible manifestation of divine blessing. After the creation and after the flood, God blesses both animals and human beings, saying, "be fruitful and multiply" (Gen. 1:22,28; 8:17; 9:1,7). The list of natural phenomena created by God mentions fruit-bearing trees explicitly (*ʿēṣ pᵉrî*, Ps. 148:9); the fruits of these trees (*pᵉrî ʿēṣ*, Gen. 1:29) are to serve as nourishment for human beings.

Descendants, the fruit of the body, are the reward of the man blessed by Yahweh (Ps. 127:3), and the woman who bestows sons upon the God-fearing, righteous man is "like a fruitful vine" (Ps. 128:3). God is able to withhold this fruit (Gen. 30:2) or destroy the fruit of the enemy (Ps. 21:11[10]). In a reverse fashion, the divine promise of such fruit of the body insures the existence of the Davidic dynasty (Ps. 132:11). Given the importance attaching to this notion, the superstitious view could arise that the fruit of the body, especially the firstborn, was an appropriate sacrifice to Yahweh in times of extreme distress (Mic. 6:7). Sir. 16:2 is the first passage to reconsider whether pride in one's growing family is appropriate if one's children do not fear God. The repeated promises that the patriarchs will have numerous descendants (Gen. 17:6,20; 35:11; 48:4) as well as accounts of their fulfillment (Gen. 47:27; Ex. 1:7) are to make the narrative transition from the eponym to the nation plausible; these etiologies express the Hebrews' pride in the numerical superiority of their people over the hostile neighboring tribes (Ps. 105:24). Precisely such association of increase with divine blessing (Gen. 28:3) comes to expression in the popular explanation of the name Ephraim (Gen. 41:52). Once they have settled in Canaan, Israel is aware that their continued existence depends on such increase. God made his people fruitful that they might possess the land (Ex. 23:30), promising them fruitfulness as long as they keep the covenant (Lev. 26:9; Dt. 7:13; 28:4); by contrast, the curse accompanying disobedience issues horrendous threats for the fate of such fruit of the body (Dt. 28:18,53). The collective personality of the people itself is occasionally portrayed metaphorically as a fruit tree (Isa. 17:6; Ezk. 19:10), in which case the individual tribal members are viewed as its fruits (Hos. 9:16). The catastrophe accompanying the fall of the kingdoms of Israel and Ju-

31. See IV.2 below.

dah fulfills Yahweh's threat that mothers would eat the fruit of their womb in those horrific conditions (Lam. 2:20). For the coming salvific age, God promises that upon returning home, his people will multiply and spread out (Jer. 3:16; 23:3; Ezk. 36:11). The Qumran writings also view "numerous descendants" *(prwt zr')* as part of the salvific promises (1QS 4:7).

Yahweh, the Lord of land and water, withdraws fruitful land (*'ereṣ pᵉrî,* Ps. 107:34) from its wicked inhabitants by turning the land into a desert; yet he also brings water to an arid region so that those who hunger can harvest fruit (v. 37). Hence one of the punishments meted out to recalcitrant peoples is to have the fruit of their land destroyed by pests (Ex. 10:12,15; Ps. 105:35) or eaten by foreigners (Ezk. 25:4). God bestowed upon Israel a land that produced the best fruit (Nu. 13:26-27; Neh. 9:36), and promised to reward it for obedience by having its trees and fields produce plentiful fruit (Lev. 25:19; 26:4; Dt. 7:13; 28:4,11; 30:9). By contrast, in the case of disobedience these trees would bear no fruit at all (Lev. 26:20), or foreign peoples would devour the fruit of the land (Dt. 28:33,42,51). Accordingly, when the prophets want to assure the people, they promise a rich yield of fruit and its enjoyment (Isa. 37:30; Joel 2:22); by contrast, when they want to unsettle the people, they promise disaster for their fields and fruit trees (Isa. 32:12). Jeremiah charges that the people defiled the land whose rich fruit they were permitted to eat (Jer. 2:7), and in response Yahweh will pour out his wrath upon people and animals, trees and fruit (Jer. 7:20). Postexilic consolations promise that fruit will come forth for enjoyment once again during the salvific age (Isa. 4:2; 65:21-22; Ezk. 34:27; 36:8,30; Am. 9:14; Zech. 8:12; Mal. 3:11).

Thanksgiving for Yahweh's gift of fruit finds its voluntary or prescribed expression in fruit offerings, for which firstfruits are viewed as being especially appropriate (Gen. 4:3; Lev. 19:23; 23:40; 27:30; Dt. 26:2,10; Neh. 10:36[35]).

2. *Figurative Use.* Theological statements use the word *pᵉrî* in two different ways. Either the fruit itself is described concretely even though it represents a different phenomenon, or the word is used in its conventional semantic expansion to mean "consequence, result." Precise distinctions between actual metaphorical usage and fixed metaphors are difficult, since *pᵉrî,* "fruit," even in its weakened sense of "consequence," can be used as a complement to *'āḵal,* "to eat," a situation then evoking the original imagery. The mythical assessment of the power inherent in fruit resonates in the paradise narrative insofar as it is the eating of a certain miraculous fruit that makes human beings like God in some sense (Gen. 3:1-22). At the same time, however, it is God himself who planted the tree in the first place (2:9) and who, if he wants, can forbid or withhold such fruit from human beings. The Qumran texts contain a midrashlike interpretation of this story that gives special attention to the fruit that God safeguards.[32]

Those who trust in God are like a healthy tree that perpetually bears fruit (Ps. 1:3; Jer. 17:8). The metaphor *pᵉrî* here doubtless allows numerous interpretations. It may refer simply to the prospering and success of the righteous, their exemplary good deeds

32. See V below.

(so Kimchi), or their unshakable faith (so Jerome). In any event, *p^erî* is viewed as the reward of the righteous within a just cosmic order (Ps. 58:12[11]), prompting the prophet Jeremiah to complain bitterly about the wicked who prosper and bear such fruit (Jer. 12:2). The wisdom writings attest a more abstract or spiritualized understanding of *p^erî*. Passions rob people of their fruit, i.e., of their most noble efforts (Sir. 6:3). The *p^erî* of the righteous (LXX: of righteousness) is a tree of life (Prov. 11:30), since an upright disposition and conduct radiate life-giving power.

Just as a certain plant yields the fruit appropriate to it, so also do a disposition and conduct pleasing to God yield beneficent consequences for all who are around such persons, while evil plans and conduct fall back onto the perpetrator. In Israel this originally dynamistic notion (Prov. 1:31; 12:14; 13:2; 18:20; Isa. 3:10; Hos. 10:13) was associated with faith in Yahweh as the just arbiter. God turns the enemy's land into desert as a result *(p^erî)* of the malicious deeds of its inhabitants (Mic. 7:13). He punishes the Assyrian king for the behavior *(p^erî)* of his insolence (Isa. 10:12), and the Judeans according to the "*p^erî* of their schemes" (Jer. 6:19). Yahweh examines people's hearts and minds that he might "give to all according to their ways and the *p^erî* of their doings" (Jer. 17:10). The recompense is justified because the human will is capable of producing poison and wormwood from a healthy root (Dt. 29:17[18]) and of changing the *p^erî* of righteousness into poison (Am. 6:12). The full fruit of the expiation of Jacob's sin is both the removal of the sin itself and the elimination of false cultic practices (Isa. 27:9). Here the meaning of *p^erî* hovers between "cause" and "effect."

A people can be compared to a tree (Isa. 17:6; Ezk. 19:10); the people's appearance, their material and spiritual accomplishments, and their rulers' power can all be compared to the fruits of trees. It is Yahweh, revealing himself in human history, who determines the fate of nations. He destroyed the "fruit above" and the "root beneath" of the Amorites when they opposed Israel (Am. 2:9). He called his own people a "green olive tree, fair with goodly fruit" (Jer. 11:16). Yet precisely such superabundance of fruit generated a superabundance of cultic sins in Israel as well (Hos. 10:1). Thus did Yahweh allow a foreign power to pick the fruit of the rejected royal house in Judah (Ezk. 17:8-9; 19:12) until the newly planted people are able to bear new fruit again in the coming salvific age (Isa. 37:31; Ezk. 17:23). A shoot from Jesse's stump will bear fruit (Isa. 11:1).[33] The ruler who follows the divine laws will bring forth the blessing of fruit (Ps. 72:16). Salvation and righteousness will sprout like fruits (Isa. 45:8). God himself will be like an evergreen to his people providing their *p^erî* (Hos. 14:9[8]), for the earth will be sated with the *p^erî* of God's acts (Ps. 104:13).

Kedar-Kopfstein

V. Qumran. The verb *pārâ* appears twice in the Qumran writings in connection with ecclesiological metaphors. Healing, peace, and "fruitfulness of the seed" (*prwt zr'*, 1QS 4:7) will all be realized in the community. The enemies of the community are like "a root bearing poisoned and bitter fruit" (*pwrh rwš*, 1QH 4:14). The noun *p^erî*

33. See III.1 above.

appears 23 times, including 6 together with *beṭen*, usually in extremely fragmentary texts (4Q173 [a citation from and *pesher* on Ps. 127:3b]; 4Q502 20:3; 163:3; 4Q503 183:1; 221:2). The brutality of the Kittim is manifested in their refusal to spare even the "fruit of the womb" (1QpHab 6:11; cf. Am. 1:13; Hos. 14:1[13:16]). The noun *pᵉrî* can also be understood ecclesiologically in that the community is like a "fruitful plant" destined for glorious bliss (1QH 8:20, though textual questions remain). It is a protected garden of paradise (cf. Gen. 3) whose fruit is watched over (1QH 8:11,13; Hos. 10:1). This passage provides the transition to the idea of creation. God created everything, including the fruits of the vine (*pᵉrî kerem*, 4Q381 1:6). Human beings were created to rule over all these things, to celebrate feasts, and to enjoy the fruits (4Q381 1:8).

The Qumranites replaced the sacrificial cult with a comprehensive and detailed cult of prayer, a situation underlying the statement that "all my life, the engraved precept shall be on my tongue as the fruit of praise *(pᵉrî tᵉhillâ)* and the portion of my lips" (1QS 10:8; cf. *pᵉrî qôḏeš* in 10:22; cf. also 1QH 1:28).

Finally, the Qumranites also celebrated a Feast of New Wine in whose rituals the "fruit of the vine" played a role (11QT 21:7, though with textual problems).

Fabry

פָּרַח *pāraḥ*; פֶּרַח *peraḥ*

Contents: I. Etymology. II. Occurrences: 1. Verb; 2. Noun. III. Qumran. IV. LXX

I. Etymology. The root *prḥ* is common to all the Semitic languages and is already attested in both Akkadian and Ugaritic. The West Semitic meaning is generally taken to be "to sprout, put forth shoots," though Akk. *parāḫu* seems to mean "to ferment."[1] The Akkadian noun *per'u* or *perḫu*, "shoot, sprout,"[2] is used in connection with plants and trees and figuratively in connection with human beings ("descendants"), often in formulas of blessing and curse (for protecting or destroying a person's descendants or offspring, etc.). The Akk. *per'u* must also be considered together with Heb. *pᵉrî*, "fruit, result, descendants." Ugaritic attests the term *prḫ*, "blossom,"[3] including twice as a

---

pāraḥ. J. Barr, *CPT*, 333, no. 264; O. Keel, *Symbolism of the Biblical World* (Eng. trans. 1978), 165; F. L. Lundgreen, *Die Benutzung der Pflanzenwelt in der alttestamentlichen Religion. BZAW* 14 (1908).

1. *AHw*, II, 827; cf. A. L. Oppenheim, *On Beer and Brewing Techniques in Ancient Mesopotamia, According to the XXIIIrd Tablet of the Series ḪAR.r a = ḫubullu. JAOSSup* 10 (1950), nn. 43, 34.
2. *AHw*, II, 856, primary noun.
3. M. Dietrich, O. Loretz, and J. Sanmartín, "Zur ugaritischen Lexikographie, XIII," *UF* 7 (1975) 166.

personal name.[4] In forms II and IV Arab. *faraḫa* means "to put forth shoots," "to have children," or "allow to slip out." In Egyptian, *prḫ* means "to bloom."[5]

II. Occurrences.

1. *Verb.* The OT uses the verb *pāraḥ* in the meaning "sprout, bloom," in connection with plants and trees (Gen. 40:10; Nu. 17:20,23[Eng. 5,8]; Job 14:9 [with the *i*-form *(yaqtil)* in the qal impf.[6]]; Cant. 6:11; 7:13[12]; Hab. 3:17). The prophets and Psalms use many metaphors from the world of plants, including *pāraḥ* as a metaphor for blooming and growing. Israel or the Israelites are often the subject of such blooming: "In days to come Jacob shall take root, Israel shall blossom and put forth shoots, and fill the whole world with fruit" (Isa. 27:6). "I will be like the dew to Israel; he shall blossom like the lily, he shall strike root like the forests of Lebanon" (Hos. 14:6[5]). "They shall again live beneath my shadow, they shall grow grain; they shall blossom like the vine, their fragrance shall be like the wine of Lebanon" (Hos. 14:8[7]).

Often, however, other subjects are used. Such include the king: "in his days may righteousness flourish and peace abound, until the moon is no more" (Ps. 72:7); the wicked: "though the wicked sprout *(prḥ)* like grass and all evildoers flourish *(ṣîṣ),* they are doomed to destruction forever" (Ps. 92:8[7]); or the righteous: "the righteous flourish *(prḥ)* like the palm tree, and grow like a cedar in Lebanon. They are planted in the house of the Lord; they flourish in the courts of our God" (Ps. 92:13-14). The best-known example is Isa. 11:1: "A shoot shall come out from the stump of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots" (here one should probably read *yiprâ;* cf. also Prov. 11:28; 14:11; Isa. 35:1-2; 45:8 [cf. 1QIsa[a] *wᵉyipraḥ*]; 66:14; Ezk. 7:10; Hos. 10:4; Hab. 2:3 [suggested cj.]; Sir. 11:22; 49:10).

Certain diseases, especially skin diseases, could be described as "blooming" (NRSV "breaking out," Lev. 13:12,20,25,39,42,57). In the same meaning, the verb is used figuratively to describe the presence of a similar phenomenon in a house (Lev. 14:43) and in reference to the "festering" of boils (Ex. 9:9-10). Such "blooming" can thus also be understood in *malam partem.* The causative sense emerges in the hiphil in the meaning "cause to sprout," as in Isa. 17:11: "though you make them [the alien tendrils] grow on the day that you plant them, and make them blossom *(prḥ)* in the morning that you sow; yet the harvest will flee away in a day of grief and incurable pain." Similarly also in Ezk. 17:24: "All the trees of the field shall know that I am Yahweh. I bring low the high tree, I make high the low tree; I dry up the green tree and make the dry tree flourish *(prḥ).*" With an internal object, the hiphil also means "to bloom," e.g., in Ps. 92:13-14(12-13) (see above) and Prov. 11:28: "the righteous will flourish like green leaves." In Ezk. 13:20 it is uncertain whether the fem. ptcp. *pōrᵉḥôṯ* derives from a different root. The meaning here seems to be "flying ones," perhaps "birds," and Zimmerli poses the question whether the word might derive

---

4. *UT,* no. 2102; *WUS,* no. 2267; *PNU,* 312, 406a.
5. *WbÄS,* I, 532.
6. Meyer, §68.2a.

from Aram. *prḥ,* "to fly." In any event, one must agree with him that "the meaning is obscure."[7]

2. *Noun.* The noun *peraḥ* has parallels in Akk. *per'u* and *perḫu,* "offspring, descendant," and Ugar. *prḫ,* "blossom."[8] In Jewish Aramaic, *parḥā'* means "blossom," while Syr. *parḥā* means "flower"; Arab. *farḫ* has the broader meaning "sprout, shoot, baby birds." In Middle Hebrew, *peraḥ* can also refer to a young person, as in the expression *pirḥê kᵉhunnâ,* "the young priests" (Mish. *Yoma* 1:7).

Nu. 17:23(8) describes how Aaron's staff sprouted. The staff represented the house of Levi and, in contrast to other staffs, blossomed and put forth flowers, indeed, even ripe almonds. In a negative context Israel's blossoms will be stirred up like dust because of their sins (Isa. 5:24; 18:5), similarly also the "bloom of Lebanon" (Nah. 1:4). Job 15:30 should probably read *pirḥô* (LXX) instead of *pîw* (MT): "and their blossom will be swept away by the wind."[9] Sir. 14:18 also uses the image of blooming flowers as a metaphor for the transience of life, while Sir. 50:8 describes the work of the high priest Simon as a "green shoot of Lebanon on a summer day."

In the Solomonic temple the bronze sea had blooming flowers around its brim (1 K. 7:26; 2 Ch. 4:5).[10] The description of the adornment on the lampstand in the tabernacle and in the Solomonic temple is unfortunately quite brief. Ex. 25:31 commands, "you shall make a lampstand of pure gold. The base and the shaft of the lampstand shall be made of hammered work; its cups, its calyxes, and its petals *(peraḥ)* shall be of one piece with it." These petals are mentioned again in vv. 33-34 in connection with "cups" and "calyxes." The lampstand's branches and shaft were adorned with "cups," each consisting of a "calyx," i.e., a bulge, and a "blossom" situated apparently on top of the calyx.[11]

Ex. 37:17ff. repeats the description of the lampstand with the same words. Nu. 8:4 also mentions the lampstand's flowers (*pirḥâ;* perhaps one should read *pᵉrāḥêhā* with Sam.). Here too we are told that Moses himself made the lampstand out of gold according to the model Yahweh showed him.

During the postbiblical period, a noticeable change occurred in the OT usage. Although the original meaning was maintained, the root was used in an unmistakably more abstract fashion.

III. Qumran. The Qumran hymns use *pāraḥ* and *peraḥ* several times in a metaphorical sense recalling that of the prophets. 1QH 6:15 reads: "a bud *(prḥ)* like a flower [that blooms] forever and shall cause a shoot to grow." 1QH 5:27 asserts that the sons of evil have a "perfidious tongue" like "the poison of dragons that makes thorns sprout *(pwrḥt)*." In 8:6-7 the singer thanks God for the trees of life that "put out a shoot of the

---

7. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), 289 n. g; cf. G. Fohrer, *Ezechiel. HAT* I/13 (²1955), 75.

8. See I above.

9. G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 263.

10. C. C. Wylie, "On King Solomon's Molten Sea," *BA* 12 (1949) 86-90.

11. M. Noth, *Exodus. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1962), 208.

everlasting plant *(lhpryḥ),* but before they did so *(ypryḥw),* they took root and sent out their roots to the watercourse." The continuation (8:10) asserts that "they will send out no root to the watercourse. And he who makes the bud of the shoot of holiness sprout forth *(wmpryḥ)* to plant the truth was hidden." A later passage in the psalm speaks of the banishment imposed on the psalmist: "My wound breaks out like burning fire *(wyprḥ k'š)* shut up in my bones" (8:30). 1QH 10:29-30 reads: "My heart rejoices in your covenant, and your truth delights my soul. I shall flower *(w'prḥh)* [ ] and my heart shall be open to the everlasting fountain." A. Dupont-Sommer has suggested inserting "like a lily" in this lacuna.[12]

IV. LXX. The LXX does not translate *pāraḥ* and *peraḥ* consistently. It generally uses *blastánō* and *blastós* to refer to the sprouting of grass or the blooming of flowers, though on occasion it uses *ánthos* similarly. In portrayals of the temple lampstand, it prefers *krínon,* perhaps in the meaning "lily" (see Mt. 6:28; Lk. 12:27).

Kapelrud†

---

12. *Essene Writings from Qumran* (Eng. trans. 1973), 235.

פָּרֹכֶת *pārōkeṯ*

Contents: I. Etymology. II. OT: 1. Meaning and Occurrences; 2. Material and Arrangement. III. Later Temples.

I. Etymology. The word *pārōkeṯ* in reference to the inner sanctuary curtain has two possible derivations. On the one hand, Akk. *parakku,* "cult pedestal/base; sanctuary; elevated seat; cella [of the deity]," was borrowed from Sum. *bára,* "elevated seat," "ruler."[1] On the other hand, the Semitic root *prk* is attested in Akkadian by the verb

---

pārōkeṯ. U. Cassuto, *Comm. on the Book of Exodus* (Eng. trans. ²1974); R. E. Friedman, "The Tabernacle in the Temple," *BA* 43 (1980) 241-48; V. Fritz, *Tempel und Zelt. WMANT* 47 (1977); M. Haran, *Temples and Temple-Service in Ancient Israel* (Oxford, 1978); G. Henton Davies, "Tabernacle," *IDB,* IV, 498-506; A. R. S. Kennedy and A. S. Herbert, "Tabernacle," *HDB* (²1963), 948-51; A. R. S. Kennedy and N. H. Snaith, "Temple," *HDB,* 961-68; S. Légasse, "Les voiles du temple de Jérusalem: Essai de parcours historique," *RB* 87 (1980) 560-89; B. A. Levine, "פָּרֹכֶת," *EMiqr* 6 (1971) 584-85; W. F. Stinespring, "Temple, Jerusalem," *IDB,* IV, 534-60.

1. *AHw,* II, 827-28.

parāku, "lay crosswise, get in the way, obstruct," and the noun *pariktu,* "something laid across; hindrance, obstruction."[2] Other words possibly also related include the Ugaritic subst. *prk* and perhaps also Phoen. *prkm,* though the latter seems to refer rather to a kind of temple servant. The Syr. *p^e^rakkā* means "sanctuary" and is probably borrowed from Akkadian, while Mand. *prikkā* refers to an altar.

II. OT.

1. *Meaning and Occurrences.* The term *pārōḵeṯ* occurs 25 times in the OT and refers exclusively to the curtain concealing and separating the holy of holies from the rest of the sanctuary. It occurs 24 times in connection with the wilderness (tent) sanctuary and once (2 Ch. 3:14) in connection with the Solomonic temple. Given its function, the *pārōḵeṯ* seems to be closely related to the meanings of Akk. *parakku* and *parāku.* The curtain functioned as a barrier obstructing access and view, and at the same time circumscribed the place where or on which God was enthroned.

Four passages (Ex. 35:12; 39:34; 40:21; Nu. 4:5) refer to the curtain as *pārōḵeṯ hammāsāḵ.* The qualifier *māsāḵ* is the same used in connection with the curtain at the tent entrance (Ex. 26:36), suggesting that the *pārōḵeṯ* served simply to separate two different parts. Lev. 4:6 calls the curtain *pārōḵeṯ haqqōḏeš,* "curtain of the sanctuary," and Lev. 24:3 calls it *pārōḵeṯ hā'ēḏûṯ,* "curtain of the testament," commensurate with the connection between the curtain and the ark in which the covenant document, the "witness," was kept (Ex. 25:16,21; 40:20).

Within the sanctuary itself, the *pārōḵeṯ* is the key location with reference to which the location of various other things is described. Whereas the curtain explicitly separates the holy of holies from the sanctuary proper (Ex. 26:33), the ark is kept "within the curtain," i.e., within the holy of holies. On the other hand, the table and lampstand are kept "outside the curtain" (26:35; 27:21), and the incense altar stands "in front of the curtain" (30:6).

The rabbis (Bab. *Sukk.* 7b) found Ex. 40:3 difficult to understand: "you shall screen *(w^e^sakkōṯā 'al)* the ark with *('eṯ)* the curtain." They interpreted this reference as a separation in the sense of a covering such that the curtain lay over the ark and looked like a cover. The verb *skk,* however, refers to making or becoming inaccessible, and its nuance must be deduced from the context. Lam. 3:44 is concerned with inaccessibility from below. The prep. *'al* refers to that which is concealed, and although the basic meaning of *'al* is indeed "on, upon," it is also well attested with the meaning "beside."[3] So there is no reason why the *pārōḵeṯ* cannot refer to a simple, vertical curtain concealing the Deity and the symbols associated with his presence from human view. Our understanding of how the *pārōḵeṯ* was hung will confirm this interpretation (see below).

2. *Material and Arrangement.* The *pārōḵeṯ* was made of "blue, purple, and crimson yarns, and of fine twisted linen." These materials were to be woven such that images of

---

2. *AHw,* II, 828-29, 833.
3. *HAL,* II, 825-26.

cherubim were discernible. Such artistic embroidery, which Ex. 26:31 calls *ḥōšēḇ*, was considered superior to the "work of a color artisan" (*rōqēm*, 26:36) consisting of a mixture of dyes and materials but not depicting any figures. Mixed fabrics such as these were reserved for the sacred sphere, and were thus forbidden in daily use (Lev. 19:19). Among the fabrics in the sanctuary, the *pārōḵeṯ* possessed the highest level of holiness, something clearly revealed by its use as a covering for the ark when it was transported (Nu. 4:5).

The *pārōḵeṯ* was hung by golden hooks on four pillars of acacia overlaid with gold (Ex. 26:32; 36:36). The hooks were probably small clasps shaped like the ancient letter *waw*, which resembled a *y*, over which a wooden pole must have been situated from which the *pārōḵeṯ* then hung down behind the pillars. According to Ex. 26:33, the *pārōḵeṯ* was hung under the hooks of the curtains of the dwelling place *(miškān)*, i.e., at a distance of 20 cubits from the tent entrance. This measurement can be figured from the fact that there were five curtains in front of the hooks, each 4 cubits wide. Behind the curtain was a room measuring 10 by 10 by 10 cubits — the holy of holies.

III. Later Temples. The fate of the *pārōḵeṯ* is uncertain. If as 2 Mc. 2:4-5 suggests the ark was removed from the first temple or otherwise taken to a safe place before the temple's destruction, one might assume that the *pārōḵeṯ* covered the ark during transport (Nu. 4:5). In the Solomonic temple, the interior was separated off not by a curtain but by a wall with a door of olive wood (1 K. 6:31). The curtain mentioned in 2 Ch. 3:14 is problematical. Although Stinespring assumes that this curtain was perhaps not part of the Solomonic temple, but rather one of its successors, the problem remains.[4] In the temple described in Ezekiel, the wall separating the two rooms was 2 cubits thick (Ezk. 41:3). The temple of Zerubbabel had a magnificent curtain separating off the interior and mentioned in connection with the objects Antiochus plundered from the temple (1 Mc. 1:22; 4:51). In the Herodian temple, two expensive curtains enclosed the holy of holies (20 by 20 cubits). According to Mish. *Yoma* 5:1, the "outer curtain was looped up on the south side and the inner one on the north side" so that on the Day of Atonement the high priest could move through the space between them from the south and enter the holy of holies from the north. Finally, the NT mentions only a single curtain (Mt. 27:51; Mk. 15:38; Lk. 23:45).

Gane — Milgrom

4. *IDB*, IV, 538.

פָּרַע pāra'; פֶּרַע pera'

Contents: I. Etymology. II. OT: 1. Verb *pāra'*; 2. Noun *pera'*. III. LXX. IV. Qumran.

I. Etymology. The etymological questions associated with Heb. *pr'* are too complicated to be discussed satisfactorily here. *BDB* enumerates no fewer than three different roots *pr'* (I: "surpass, lead"; II: "sprout"; III: "let go, loose"),[1] whereas *HAL* (like Gesenius previously) assumes the presence of only a single, albeit semantically comprehensive root (in the qal the verb means "to let free," "let the hair of the head hang loosely," "make someone go out of control, allow to run wild," and "leave unattended"; the noun refers to "loosely hanging and unplaited hair on the head," "leader, prince").[2]

It seems more appropriate, however, to explain the OT occurrences of Heb. *pr'* with reference to two different Arabic roots. The first is *fara'a* I, "surpass"; *far'*, "branch," "hair",[3] a root also evident in the Heb. noun *pera'* in the meaning "prince" (Dt. 32:42; Jgs. 5:2?; cf. Ugar. *pr'*, "prince"; "firstling"; *pr't*, "princess"[4]). The second is *faraġa* I, "be empty, exhausted," "be free," "dedicate oneself,"[5] which seems to be related to a whole series of OT occurrences of *pr'*; cf. OSA *fr'* (noun: "yield, firstlings"; verb: "present, pay");[6] Sam. *pryth* < **pry'th*, "payment," "punishment";[7] Mand. *pra* IV, "let loose," "pay back";[8] Old Aram. *pr'*, "pay"; *pr'n*, "payment";[9] Palm. *pr'*, "pay";[10] Syr. *pr'* I, "to bare (one's head); loosen (one's hair)"; II, "produce (leaves, fruit)"; aphel, "sprout"; III, "pay";[11] Rabbinic Hebrew/Aramaic;[12] Christian Palestinian Aram. *pwr't*, "compensation"; verb ithpeel, "receive a reward";[13] Egyp.

---

pāra'. P. C. Craigie, "A Note on Judges V 2," *VT* 18 (1968) 397-99; J. Henninger, "Zur Frage des Haaropfers bei den Semiten," *FS des Institutes für Völkerkunde Horn-Wien* (Vienna, 1956), 349-68 = *Arabica Sacra = Aufsätze zur Religionsgeschichte Arabiens und seiner Randgebiete. OBO* 40 (1981), 286-306.

1. *BDB*, 828b-29a.
2. *HAL*, III, 970-71; *GesTh*, II, 1128.
3. Lane, I/6, 2378b-80c.
4. *KTU* 2.31 15?, 16, 37; *KTU* 1.8, 9; see *UT*, no. 2113; *WUS*, no. 2276; *CML*², 156a; S. Segert, "Le rôle de l'ugaritique dans la linguistique sémitique comparée," *Ugaritica* VI (1969) 473; Krašovec, *Der Merismus im Biblisch-Hebräischen und Nordwestsemitischen*. *BietOr* 33 (1977), 134, no. 201; *HAL*, III, 971.
5. Lane, I/6, 2381a-83a.
6. Biella, 410-11.
7. *LOT*, II, 564; III/2, 63.
8. *MdD*, 377-78.
9. S. Segert, *Altaramäische Grammatik* (Leipzig, 1975), 547-48.
10. *DNSI*, II, 942.
11. *LexSyr*, 603-4.
12. Jastrow, 1235-36.
13. F. Schulthess, *Lexicon Syro-palaestinum* (Berolini, 1903), 163.

Aramaic,[14] Sirach,[15] and Qumran.[16] The Akk. *pertu,* "hair (on the head)," is a primary noun.[17]

II. OT. The root *pr'* does not occur frequently in the OT. The verb occurs 13 times in the qal (Ex. 32:25[bis]; Lev. 10:6; 13:45; 21:10; Nu. 5:18; Jgs. 5:2; Prov. 1:25; 4:15; 8:33; 13:18; 15:32; Ezk. 24:14; and possibly by cj. in Job 33:24[18]), once in the niphal (Prov. 29:18), and twice in the hiphil (Ex. 5:4; 2 Ch. 28:19). The noun *pera'* occurs 4 times (Nu. 6:5; Dt. 32:42; Jgs. 5:2; Ezk. 44:20). Many lexicographers associate *pr'* with the place-name *pir'āṯôn* (modern Far'âtā, 9 km. west-southwest of Nablus [Shechem]),[19] and with the gentilic *pir'āṯônî* (Jgs. 12:13,15; 2 S. 23:30; 1 Ch. 11:31; 27:14).

1. *Verb pāra'.* Among the occurrences of the verb *pāra'* in the qal, noteworthy examples include especially those referring in the Priestly laws (Ex. 25–Nu. 10) to the hair on a person's head.[20] H stipulates that during the seven days of his consecration,[21] the high priest is to keep rigorous purity; among other things, he "shall not let his hair hang loose, not tear his vestments" (*'eṯ-rō'šô lō' yiprā' ûḇᵉgāḏāyw lō' yiprōm,* Lev. 21:10). A similar regulation applies to the Aaronite priests (Lev. 10:6); after ordination the priests are to trim their hair regularly (Ezk. 44:20).[22] By contrast, the hair of a leper (Lev. 13:45)[23] or of a woman suspected of adultery (Nu. 5:18)[24] is to hang loose. In the first instance, the loose hair is probably meant less as an identifying feature or as an expression of sadness than as an apotropaic gesture.[25] In the second, it represents perhaps a kind of disfigurement in anticipation of a negative sentence.[26]

Both the meaning and the background of the beginning of the Song of Deborah, *biprōa' pᵉrā'ōṯ bᵉyiśrā'ēl* (Jgs. 5:2), are the subject of vehement dispute. It can be understood against the background of consecration for holy war, "when the flowing hair was let loose in Israel."[27] Of course, one can also understand the expression as a reference to the military leaders, "that leaders led in Israel"[28] (LXX^{A}, *en tṓ árxasthai archēgoús*). Finally, Craigie's explanation with reference to Arab. *faraġa* is worth con-

14. *AP* 17.6?
15. R. Smend, *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach erklärt* (Berlin, 1906), 76.
16. See IV below.
17. *AHw,* II, 856.
18. According to G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 453, 455; et al.
19. *GTTOT,* sm601, 663-65; cf. *BDB,* 828b; *HAL,* III, 971.
20. → שֵׂעָר *śē'ār.*
21. See M. Haran, *EncJud,* XIII, 1081.
22. See 2 below.
23. → צרעת *ṣāra'aṯ.*
24. → נאף *nā'ap.*
25. K. Elliger, *Leviticus. HAT* IV (1966), 185; cf. Henninger, 361-68.
26. M. Noth, *Numbers. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1968), in loc.
27. E.g., J. Gray, *Joshua, Judges, and Ruth. NCBC* (1986), 276; cf. *HAL,* III, 971.
28. H. W. Hertzberg, *Die Bücher Josua, Richter, Ruth. ATD* 9 ([4]1974), 171; cf. Krašovec, *Merismus,* 134; cf. also Ugar. *pr'/pr't;* see I above.

sidering: "When the people offered themselves completely," which parallels the following sentence nicely.[29]

The remaining qal occurrences refer primarily to moral dissolution. The narrative of the golden calf recounts how Moses "saw that the people were running wild *(pārua')*, for Aaron had let them run wild *(pᵉrā'ōh)*" (Ex. 32:25). In Proverbs *pr'* generally means that a person has "ignored" or "neglected" discipline or advice (1:25; 8:33; 13:18; 15:32), and once that a person "avoided" (in the sense of "left alone") the path of the wicked (4:15). Finally, Ezk. 24:14 asserts that Yahweh's statement will not "be ignored." The only occurrence of *pr'* in the niphal also refers to moral dissolution: "Where there is no vision, the people go wild [NRSV 'cast off restraint']" *(bᵉ'ên ḥāzôn yippāra' 'ām,* Prov. 29:18).[30]

Related meanings appear in the two hiphil occurrences as well. According to the Chronicler's History, King Ahaz "caused things to get out of control in Judah" *(hiprîa' bîhûḏâ,* 2 Ch. 28:19), and according to Ex. 5:4 the Egyptian king complains to Moses and Aaron, "Why are you freeing the people [*tapri'û;* Sam. *tprydw!*] from their work?"

2. *Noun pera'.* The noun *pera'* occurs 4 times, twice each in the singular (Nu. 6:5; Ezk. 44:20) and the plural (Dt. 32:42; Jgs. 5:2). The two singular occurrences refer unmistakably to "freely hanging/disheveled hair." The Priestly law of the temporally circumscribed *nāzîr* vow (Nu. 6:1-21) stipulates that "no razor shall come upon the head" of the nazirites during the period of their vow; "they shall be holy; they shall let the locks of the head grow long" *(gaddēl pera' śᵉ'ar rō'šô,* v. 5; cf. Jgs. 13:5; 16:17; 1 S. 1:11). The consecrated nazirites' special relationship with God is thus manifested in the disheveled condition of their hair, which contains the consecration in a symbolic-actual fashion.[31] The great vision of the future in Ezekiel (chs. 40–48) makes different arrangements for the Zadokite priests, who "shall not shave their heads or let their locks grow long" *(ûpera' lō' yᵉšallēḥû);* instead, "they shall only trim the hair of their heads" *(kāsôm yiḵsᵉmû,* 44:20; cf. Akk. *kasāmu,* "cut up"; Arab. *kašama,* "cut off"; Ugar. *ksm,* "section"[32]). The rabbis (Bab. *Sanh.* 22b) understood that a high priest was to trim his hair weekly, but a priest only once a month.[33]

Both occurrences in the plural are ambiguous. In the Song of Moses, one oracle of Yahweh reads: "I will make my arrows drunk with blood . . . with the blood of the slain and the captives, *mērō'š par'ôṯ 'ôyēḇ*" (Dt. 32:42), which can mean either "of the head of the enemy's leaders,"[34] or "of the head of enemy, with loosely hanging hair."[35] (On Jgs. 5:2 see II.1 above.)

---

29. Craigie, 399; cf. *HAL,* III, 970a.
30. → חזה *ḥāzâ (chāzāh),* IV, 280ff.; O. Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos (Proverbia). BK* XVII (1984), 347.
31. → נזר *nzr,* esp. II.1.
32. *HAL,* II, 490.
33. See Haran, *EncJud,* XIII, 1081.
34. G. von Rad, *Deuteronomy. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1966), 195.
35. See *HAL,* III, 970-71.

III. LXX. The LXX renders *pr'* in several different ways. For example, twice it renders the verb in the qal with *apokidaróō* (Lev. 10:6; 21:10); cf. also *apokalýptō* (Nu. 5:18; cf. Lev. 13:45) and *aphairéō* (Prov. 13:18).

IV. Qumran. The root *pr'* occurs only rarely in the Qumran writings. The Damascus Document twice says that the "princes of Judah" *(śry yhwdh)* "let themselves go with raised hand *(wypr'w byd rmh)* to walk on the path(s) of the wicked" (8:8-9; 19:21). The verb possibly appears in 1QS 6:26 as well in the meaning "break asunder [the basis of a community]" *(l[pr]w')*. Two texts from Murabba'at contain altogether three occurrences of *pr'*: the Heb. noun *pr'n*, "payment,"[36] and the Aram. verb *pr'* in the ithpeel (with assimilated *t;* cf. *'ippārû'ê*, Bab. *B.M.* 16a) in the meaning "be paid."[37] Both the Heb. noun *pērā'ôn* and the Aramaic verb in the ithpeel in the meanings indicated are well known from rabbinic literature.[38]

Kronholm†

---

36. J. T. Milik, *DJD*, II, 22 (131 C.E.), 1-9, 2 and 10 (in part by cj.).

37. J. T. Milik, *DJD*, II, 18, 6, presumably deposited in Murabba'at during the period of the First Jewish Revolt (the text has *'prw'nk*).

38. See Jastrow, 1172a, 1236a.

פַּרְעֹה *par'ōh*

Contents: I. Occurrences, Etymology. II. 1. Egyptian Royal Title; 2. OT. III. Pharaoh in the OT: 1. Plague Narrative; 2. Prophets. IV. Occurrences after the OT.

---

par'ōh. M. Ellenbogen, *Foreign Words in the OT* (London, 1962), 139; S. Morenz and B. Reicke, "Pharao," *BHHW*, III, 1445-47; J. Vergote, *Joseph en Égypte. Orientalia et Biblica Lovaniensia* 3 (Leuven, 1959), esp. 45-48.

Egypt: E. Edel, "Die Stelen Amenophis' II. aus Karnak und Memphis," *ZDPV* 69 (1953) 97-176, esp. 145; A. Gardiner, *Egyptian Grammar* (Oxford, ³1979), esp. 71-76; J. Osing, "Pharao," *LexÄg*, IV, 1021; G. Posener, *Dictionnaire de la civilisation égyptienne* (Paris, 1959), esp. 218-22; idem, *De la divinité du Pharaon* (Paris, 1960); J. Vergote, "L'étymologie du mot papyrus," *Chronique d'Égypte* 60 (Brussels, 1985), 393-97.

On Pharaoh's Stubbornness: F. Hesse, *Das Verstockungsproblem im AT. BZAW* 74 (1955), esp. 7-21; B. Jacob, "Gott und Pharao," *MGWJ* 68 (1924) 118-26, 202-11; H. Räisänen, *The Idea of Divine Hardening* (Helsinki, ²1976); K. L. Schmidt, "Die Verstockung des Menschen durch Gott," *TZ* 1 (1945) 1-17; R. R. Wilson, "The Hardening of Pharaoh's Heart," *CBQ* 41 (1979) 18-36.

I. Occurrences, Etymology. The word *par'ōh* occurs 268 times in the OT, also *par'ōh nᵉḵōh* (5 times) and *par'ōh ḥopra'* (6 times). It occurs 6 times in the Abraham cycle, 14 in the Moses cycle, 7 in Deuteronomy, 17 in the Dtr History, 28 in the Prophets (4 in Isaiah, 11 in Jeremiah, 13 in Ezekiel, none in the Minor Prophets), 6 in the Writings, though none in the wisdom literature (a possible exception being Sir. 16:15).[1] The LXX contains 32 occurrences beyond the MT. Since the Hebrew word is never used with the article, it was apparently understood as a personal name. The word represents a transliteration of Egyp. *pr-'ȝ*, pronounced *pir-ô*, in Akkadian *pi-ir-'u-u*, in Coptic *(p)rro* or *ouro*, in Hebrew *par'ōh*, and in Greek *pharaṓ*.

II. 1. *Egyptian Royal Title.* In Egypt this term was not one of the royal titles. Translated literally, its earliest meaning was "great house," i.e., the palace or residence (of the king and his administration). That is, it referred to the person of the king not in his divine essence, but rather in the ordinances and commands he issued to his administration. Nonetheless, from the Twelfth Dynasty on (2000-1800 B.C.E.), it was associated with the three wishes following the actual royal name: life, health, and power. Beginning with Amenophis II (15th century; according to Osing, this practice began already with Thutmose III[2]), the title was transferred to the king himself, as was later also the case during the Amarna period. During the Nineteenth Dynasty, the term acquired a status equal to that of the title *ḥm.f*, "his [God's] servant." It was not until the Twenty-second Dynasty, under Shishak I (a contemporary of Solomon and Jeroboam/Rehoboam), that the title became a fixed part of the king's name and began to be entered in the royal cartouche.

2. *OT.* The distribution of the biblical occurrences corresponds to this development in Egypt. Thus neither Genesis nor Exodus ever mentions the name of the pharaoh. The first appearances of the name are that of Neco in 2 K. 23:29 and Hophra in Jer. 44:30. Shishak is called the "king of Egypt" (1 K. 14:25), but not "Pharaoh"; similarly also So (2 K. 17:4), whose Horus name it was.[3] Both the Joseph (Gen. 40:1) and Moses narratives (Ex. 1:8,15-18; 3:18-19; 5:4-6; 14:5) alternate between the titles "Pharaoh" and "king of Egypt." Rather than representing different theological perspectives, this alternation probably reflects terminological peculiarities within the Pentateuch sources themselves.[4] In fact, the two titles were later combined (Ex. 6:11,29 P). In the texts of the Abraham and Joseph narratives, the term is used to symbolize the more or less personified power of oppression.

---

1. Cf. the LXX eds. of Rahlfs and Ziegler.
2. See *Urk.* IV, 1248, 16.
3. See R. Sayed, "Tefnakht ou Horus SIȝ," *VT* 20 (1970) 116ff.; a different view is taken by K. Kitchen, *The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt* (Oxford, 1973), 373.
4. See H. Cazelles, "Rédactions et traditions dans l'Exode," *Studien zum Pentateuch. FS W. Kornfeld* (Vienna, 1977), 43-44.

III. Pharaoh in the OT.

1. *Plague Narrative.* In the plague narrative the pharaoh's behavior represents in a proverbial fashion the hardening of a person's heart.[5] It was probably the Yahwist who introduced this theological motif,[6] though the expression he uses is ultimately a translation of Egyp. *dns ib,* which refers to those who think only they are important, those who pay no attention to others.[7] The literary strata in this text are difficult to assign. Perhaps it was the Elohist who applied *ḥzq* as an expression of strength and the exercise of power (cf. *yāḏ,* Ex. 6:1[8]) to the hardening of the heart[9] (9:35; 10:20). On the other hand, it may be a Priestly text, since P generally uses the term either in the qal (7:13,22; 8:15), piel (9:12; 11:10; 14:8), or hiphil (7:3). The subject of the action is then God himself; in all likelihood, some dependence on the Isaianic call story is probably at work here (Isa. 6:9-10).[10]

2. *Prophets.* The Twelve do not mention Pharaoh. Isaiah warns the Jerusalem court against depending on the princes of Tanis/Zoan who claim to be the counselors of Pharaoh, descendants of ancient kings, and successors to the great wise men: "The princes of Zoan are utterly foolish; the wise counselors of Pharaoh give stupid counsel" (Isa. 19:11). Although the prophet does not attack the pharaoh directly, he does assess his power as "nothing," as a deceptive shelter (cf. Nu. 14:9; Lam. 4:20). Isaiah is thus actually directing his words against the wise men of Jerusalem who failed to seek Yahweh before issuing their own counsel.

Jeremiah and Ezekiel attack with considerably more vehemence. Jeremiah knows that Pharaoh has a palace (Jer. 43:9), and an army (37:5,7,11) capable of taking Gaza (47:1). Yahweh, however, is watching Pharaoh (*pôqēḏ,* 46:25; cf. 5:1; 13:21), and ultimately both the pharaoh and his god Amon will be delivered over to the king of Babylon. He will be called a "braggart *(šā'ôn)* who missed his chance *(he'ᵉḇîr)*" (v. 17).[11] C. Cornill understood the verb *he'ᵉḇîr* as a wordplay on the name Hophra (*w'ḥ-ib-Re';* LXX and Syr., however, both read "Neco"). Like the other nations, Pharaoh will feel Yahweh's wrath (25:19).

During the time of Zedekiah, Ezekiel takes an even harsher line against this illusion of power, especially during the siege of Jerusalem. Despite the overwhelming number of his subjects (Ezk. 31:2), despite his glory and greatness (v. 18), this young lion of the nations (32:2) and dragon in the sea (32:2; 29:3) will be thrown to the ground in a dragnet and flung out as fodder (32:4-5). His arm will be broken[12] and made weak, for

---

5. See B. S. Childs, *Exodus. OTL* (1974), 171-74.

6. See Wilson, 27.

7. See *WbÄS,* V, 468.

8. See Cazelles, 43 n. 24.

9. Wilson, 27ff.

10. → חזק *ḥāzaq (chāzaq),* IV, 308.

11. W. Rudolph, *Jeremia. HAT* I/12 (^{3}1968), 232; cf. M. D. McDonald, "Prophetic Oracles Concerning Egypt" (diss., Baylor, 1978), 227-31.

12. See W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1983), 131-32.

Yahweh is against him (30:21-25). In a vision recalling Isa. 14, Ezekiel sees the pharaoh, who once spread terror throughout the land, descending into Sheol, where he perishes amid the uncircumcised (32:31-32). He is the cedar who with the other trees from Eden descended into the netherworld (31:15ff.). A political power of this sort cannot provide deliverance (17:17). Egypt will be renewed, not Pharaoh (29:13-16).

IV. Occurrences after the OT. The Qumranrites also view the terrible annihilation of the pharaoh and his army at the Reed Sea (Ex. 14) as a salvific prototype for Yahweh's deliverance of the faithful and the destruction of their enemies (1QM 11:9-10). 4QAges of Creation may also allude to this topos.[13]

The apocryphal writings mention Pharaoh only in references to OT texts (27 times in Jubilees, 4 in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs), and always while clearly alluding to his stubbornness (3 Mc 2:6; 6:4). Acts 7:10 and 13 recall the pharaoh of the Joseph narrative. According to Heb. 11:24, Moses hesitated to be called the son of Pharaoh for reasons of faith. Rom. 9:17 cites Ex. 9:16 and its assertion that Yahweh intended to show his power and to make his name known in all the earth by means of the pharaoh.

Cazelles

13. 4QAges of Creation (180) frs. 5-6.5, severely fragmented.

פָּרַץ *pāraṣ*; פֶּרֶץ *pereṣ*; פָּרִיץ *pārîṣ*; מִפְרָץ *mip̱rāṣ*

Contents: I. 1. Occurrences; 2. Etymology; 3. LXX. II. 1. Verb; 2. *pereṣ* and *pārîṣ*.

I. 1. *Occurrences.* Within the OT (only in Hebrew), the word group *pāraṣ* occurs 96 times. The verb occurs 48 times, including 45 times in the qal (though textual problems

pāraṣ. W. Borée, *Die alten Ortsnamen Palästinas* (1930; Hildesheim, [2]1968); G. R. Driver, "The Root פרץ in Hebrew," *JTS* 25 (1924) 177-78; idem, "Studies in the Vocabulary of the OT III," *JTS* 32 (1931) 361-66, esp. 365; J. J. Glück, "The Verb PRṢ in the Bible and in the Qumran Literature," *RevQ* 5 (1964/65) 123-27; C. Toll, "Die Wurzel PRṢ im Hebräischen," *OrS* 21 (1972) 73-86; idem, "Ausdrücke für 'Kraft' im AT mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Wurzel BRK," *ZAW* 94 (1982) 111-23; A. Vaccari, "Le radici תרץ e פרץ nell'Ebraico Biblico," *Bibl* 19 (1938) 308-15; T. Veijola, *Verheissung in der Krise: Studien zur Literatur und Theologie der Exilszeit anhand des 89. Psalms. AnAcScFen* B 220 (1982); J. Ziegler, "Ps 144,14," *Wort und Geschichte. FS K. Elliger. AOAT* 18 (1973), 191-97.

attach to Neh. 2:13; 4:1; 1 Ch. 13:2; 2 Ch. 11:23; in the first two passages, one should read *pᵉrāṣîm,*[1] and in 2 Ch. 11:23 a different verb,[2] perhaps also in 1 Ch. 13:2[3]), and once each in the niphal, pual, and hithpael. Nominal derivatives include *pereṣ,* occurring 18 times as a noun (moreover as a textual emendation in Neh. 2:13; 4:1; see above), 15 times as the name of a Judean clan (also once as *parṣî*), and 7 times as a geographical designation; the other noun derivatives are *pārîṣ* with 6 occurrences, and the hapax legomenon *miprāṣ.* In the Hebrew portions of Sirach, the verb occurs once in the qal and the noun *pereṣ* once.

2. *Etymology.* This word group has the basic meaning "break through," generally in concrete reference to a wall, whence "make a breach in a wall" (which also explains the relatively frequent use of the verb with *bᵉ*). The corresponding Akkadian verb is *parāṣu,* "break through," a word also often used with "wall" as its object, along with its noun derivatives *pe/irṣum,* "breakthrough, breach in a wall or in a canal dike," and *parriṣu,* occurring most frequently in Neo-Assyrian letters in the meaning "one who breaches the law, lawbreaker."[4] Among the older Semitic languages, the word group appears only in Ugaritic.[5] In Middle Hebrew it preserves the basic meaning but especially comes to mean "be lawless, unrestrained," in the sense of a deviation from the established order.[6] The group occurs only in isolated passages in the Qumran writings. Middle Hebrew also influenced its presence in later Aramaic languages, where it preserved the same semantic spectrum (e.g., in Jewish Aramaic and Mandaic[7]). Northern Arabic equivalents possibly include *faraḍa* in the meaning "make a notch, cut," yielding also the noun *furḍa,* "crevice, opening,"[8] which in its specialized reference to a "cleft, cut into a shoreline" in the sense of a landing spot for ships is perhaps an equivalent for *miprāṣ* in Jgs. 5:17.[9] The Old South Arabic term *frḍ* is a "fissure/crack in a dam."[10]

Because all the OT occurrences of this group presuppose this basic meaning, there is no need to consider the presence of other roots (Driver, *HAL*) or an alternative basic meaning out of which the basic one may have developed and which some passages still preserve (Glück). The verb *pāṣar,* which is semantically equivalent with some occurrences of *pāraṣ,*[11] may at least in the qal represent a secondary form of the latter.[12]

---

1. See *BHS;* also W. Rudolph, *Esra und Nehemia. HAT* I/20 (1949), 110, 124.
2. See *BHS;* also W. Rudolph, *Chronikbücher. HAT* I/21 (1955), 232.
3. See *BHS;* a different view is taken by Rudolph, *Chronikbücher,* 110; concerning the cj. in Jer. 2:24, see II.1 below.
4. *AHw,* II, 832, 834, 855.
5. *WUS,* no. 2280; *UT,* no. 2117; see also *HAL,* III, 971-72.
6. Jastrow, 1227-28.
7. Jastrow, 1227, 1237, 1172; *MdD,* 372, 380; cf. also *LexSyr*², 605.
8. Lane, I/6, 2373, 2374.
9. For other interpretations see *GesB,* 450; *HAL,* II, 618.
10. Beeston, 46.
11. See II.1 below.
12. Concerning the obscure hiphil, see *HAL,* III, 954-55; and H. J. Stoebe, *Das erste Buch Samuelis. KAT* VIII/1 (1973), 291.

Toll's thesis is also to be rejected according to which the basic meaning became specialized as a sexual reference, a sense then to be presupposed either directly or indirectly for most occurrences. The thesis is questionable not least because it depends on the exegesis of a single passage (Hos. 4:10) while remaining purely hypothetical with regard to all the others.[13]

3. *LXX.* The LXX renders this word group quite diversely and in part quite freely. It renders the qal of the verb frequently with *kathaireín* (9 times) and *diakóptein* or *diakopḗ* (8 times). The equivalent of the specialized meaning "press, urge someone" is *biázesthai* or a compound using that term (similarly also for the qal of *pāṣar*). The rendering of the meaning "spread out, increase" is quite diversified. The LXX uses *diastéllein* for the niphal, *kathaireín* (pass.) for the pual, and *anachōreín* for the hithpael. The noun *pereṣ* is frequently rendered with *diakopḗ, phragmós,* as well as with forms and derivatives of *píptein;* the noun *pārîṣ* is rendered twice with *loimós* (only once with *lēstḗs* [Jer. 7:11], whence it was adopted into the NT; cf. Mk. 11:17 par.).

II. 1. *Verb.* Commensurate with the root's basic meaning, the most frequent object of the verb is a wall, especially a protective city wall[14] into which during a war one or several breaches are made, exposing the defenseless city as a whole to the enemy (2 K. 14:13 [2 Ch. 25:23]; 2 Ch. 26:6). Hence a city can be defended or can reestablish itself only if a wall thus breached (qal pass. ptcp., 2 Ch. 32:5; pual ptcp., Neh. 1:3) is closed up again. If this work is performed hastily or shabbily, however, then the breaches can easily be reopened (Neh. 3:35[4:3]). Prov. 25:28 uses such a city *('îr pᵉrûṣâ),* i.e., one with no (intact) wall, as a point of comparison for persons without self-control, persons who put themselves in the wrong with others and are thus defenseless against subsequent attacks. After the city wall, it is the layered stone wall protecting a vineyard or flock *(gāḏēr, gᵉḏērâ)* that can be breached and, because of its loose construction, easily collapses; breaching such a wall is virtually the same as simply tearing the wall down. This situation illustrates the catastrophe God has imposed on Israel (Isa. 5:5 and Ps. 80:13[Eng. 12] view Israel as a vineyard; Ps. 89:41[40] compares the fortified cities[15] [probably the border fortresses protecting the countryside] to the walls of a livestock paddock[16]). According to Eccl. 10:8, the danger accompanying the destruction of such a wall is a metaphor for how quickly and unexpectedly human actions can have disastrous consequences. The absolute use of the verb in Eccl. 3:3 is also based on the notion of breaking through or tearing down a wall. Here it becomes a universal metaphor for those processes of breaking down and building up that are part of the various stages of human life (similar to Sir. 7:17, which warns against considering "tearing down" too hastily [qal inf. const.]).[17]

---

13. On Hos. 4:10 see II.1 below.
14. → חומה *ḥômâ (chômāh),* IV, 267ff.
15. → מבצר *mibṣār.*
16. See Veijola, 100-101, 167-68.
17. → אמר *'āmar,* I, 328ff., esp. §II.4.

2 Ch. 24:7 also presupposes the notion of breaching or tearing down a wall. The context suggests that the reference is to unaddressed building damage. The wording, however, wants to make clear that the situation involved a conscious act of destruction.

Only in isolated instances are other objects mentioned or presupposed. Job 28:4 (textual emendation; see *BHS*) refers to shafts opened during mining (the actual object is probably the earth itself, which is breached like a wall when such shafts are opened). 2 Ch. 20:37 applies the verb in the general sense of "break up, destroy" to shipwrecks caused by God.

The comparisons in Isa. 5:5 and Ps. 80:13(12) are essentially directed to Israel, i.e., to a human object, with God as subject (for Isa. 5:5 cf. v. 7). Hence when the subject is God, human beings can be the direct objects of the verb. In his misery Job describes himself metaphorically as a city into whose walls God bursts breach after breach (Job 16:14). Commensurately, God can also make a breach in the entire people of Israel, i.e., move against it with terrible power such that whole portions of the population are killed (Ex. 19:22,24; Ps. 60:3[1]). According to Ps. 106:29, a plague caused by God annihilates many of the people.

2 S. 6:8 (= 1 Ch. 13:11) applies this notion to individuals whom God utterly destroys. The construction with b^e suggests that here too the point of departure is the notion of a breach made in an individual as in a wall, a notion understood *pars pro toto* as a reference to complete destruction (the Chronicler's interpretation in 1 Ch. 15:13 understands this case similar to the previous examples as a breach in the people as a whole).

With a somewhat weakened meaning, the verb can also refer to the kind of human interaction in which one or more persons break through another like a wall, i.e., overcome hesitation on that person's part to persuade the person to make a particular decision or to take a specific course of action (1 S. 28:23; 2 S. 13:25,27; 2 K. 5:23; corresponding to the qal of *pāṣar* in Gen. 19:3,9; 33:11; Jgs. 19:7; 2 K. 2:17; 5:16).[18]

All the passages discussed to this point have basically presupposed that the wall is breached or torn down from the outside, exposing thus the defenseless area behind it; i.e., they focus on the aspect of destruction. The remaining passages presuppose precisely the opposite, namely, that the restricting, imprisoning wall is sundered from the inside to gain space and freedom, and the decisive notion is the aspect of deliverance and expansion. Mic. 2:13 compares the people of Israel who have been gathered together from the dispersion (v. 12) to a flock in a pen that is too confining; the lead animal *(pōrēṣ*, a metaphor for God) breaks through the gate to allow the flock to spread out freely and undisturbed (for detailed interpretation see comms.). According to 2 S. 5:20 (= 1 Ch. 14:11), God has broken through David's enemies the way water, after a torrential downpour, breaks through all obstructions and floods downhill.[19] Gen. 38:29

18. See in this regard I.2 above.

19. See H. W. Hertzberg, *I & II Samuel. OTL* (Eng. trans. [2]1960), 274.

describes how during the birth process the newborn violently breaks out of the mother's womb through a breach. Prov. 3:10 uses the verb metaphorically. Those who observe their cultic obligations (v. 9) will find that their vats will be bursting, i.e., will be filled beyond capacity and overflow with wine. CD 20:25 speaks explicitly about breaking through a boundary, in this instance that of the → תורה *tôrâ*. Those who have entered into the covenant of the new community (cf. 20:12) now violently wrest themselves free, albeit only to move toward their own future destruction.

Jer. 2:24 is essentially also speaking about breaking through a boundary, if one follows the generally accepted conjecture made by L. Köhler.[20] Here Israel is like a camel in heat (v. 23) that breaks out of the cultivated land and escapes to the unrestricted expanse of the wilderness. The same basically also applies to the hithpael in 1 S. 25:10 in reference to escaped slaves. The slaves actually "break out," i.e., create a breach or a way out (the construction with *mippᵉnê* in v. 10bβ militates against the assumption that the hithpael actually means "act as a predator, freebooter" [as a derivation from *pārîṣ*][21]).

The remaining passages also evoke the image of a boundary being breached like a wall. These passages, however, now focus wholly on the aspect of gaining space and expanding as the result and goal of such a breach. In such cases the verb can be rendered directly as "expand, spread out," albeit not in the sense of an organic, peaceful development, but as the result of a breach intended to provide access into previously inaccessible spheres whose possession then becomes an expression of power and superiority. Jacob's descendants will be so numerous that they will spread out in all directions (Gen. 28:14), i.e., they will break through the narrower family framework and force their way out toward all sides. The same applies to the revivified Israel in the coming salvific age (Isa. 54:3) or, as an event that has already occurred, to Israel in Egypt (Ex. 1:12). 1 Ch. 4:38 refers specifically to the numerical increase or expansion of certain families, a process leading inevitably, however, to the possession of the new land (vv. 39ff.). Hos. 4:10 refers to the opposite result of the same process. Even though the people "play the whore" and engage in fertility rites to insure numerous descendants (*hiznû* as an internal-causative hiphil), they will in fact not increase at all and thus also not acquire any new land. The image refers in a general sense to Israel rather than merely to the priests addressed in vv. 4ff. (but cf. v. 9, which may, however, be secondary; Toll's assumption that the reference here is to the sexual notion of "be potent" in the sense of sexual penetration into the female is both unnecessary and unprovable, since none of the other occurrences of the word group offers any support for such a view). In Gen. 30:43 an individual is the subject of the verb, and the reference is to the increase of his (livestock) possessions, metaphorically to his economic breakthrough and acquisition of property. In Gen. 30:30 and Job 1:10, such possessions are themselves the subject; in the first passage both

---

20. L. Köhler, "Beobachtungen am hebräischen und griechischen Text von Jeremia Kap. 1–9," *ZAW* 29 (1909) 35-36; see *BHS*.

21. Stoebe, *Samuelis*, 447.

the formulation and the context suggest that an unexpected change has taken place such that the possessions have, as it were, broken out of their previous boundaries and now are "spreading out" or increasing all about. Subjects can also include abstractions. In Hos. 4:2 it is Israel's own misbehavior that forcefully spreads out in the land *(pārāṣû* belongs syntactically with v. 2a, probably with an understood *bā'āreṣ;* see *BHS),* and in 2 Ch. 31:5 a royal decree (cf. v. 4) that spreads among the people, i.e., becomes known and takes effect.

The niphal in 1 S. 3:1, referring to divine revelations, is probably to be understood similarly such that at the time, no vision had spread, i.e., had become widely known and authoritative.

2. *pereṣ and pārîṣ.* Commensurate with the basic meaning of this word group, the noun *pereṣ* refers almost exclusively to the breach or rift in a wall. In Neh. 2:13; 4:1(7); 6:1; Am. 4:3, the reference is to breaches made in the city wall during a siege.[22] Accordingly, Isa. 58:12 and Am. 9:11 promise that one essential feature of the future salvific age will be the walling up *(gāḏar)* of such breaches. The reconstruction in Am. 9:11b (emended text; see *BHS*) is associated with fortress walls, not with the walls of a house; *pereṣ* (and *pāraṣ*) as well as *gāḏar* (and *gāḏēr*) never refer to house walls, and the *sukkâ* mentioned in v. 11a is not a fixed or sturdy house in any event. Hence only v. 11a makes a metaphorical statement, v. 11b a concrete one (figurative only insofar as God remains the subject). The *sukkâ* is a metaphor either for the city of Jerusalem or for the kingdom of the salvific age and its fortified cities in the larger sense.[23] 1 K. 11:27 refers to a remaining breach that is closed up during Solomon's construction activities.[24]

The remaining passages use the word in comparisons or metaphors. To Job, the forces of misfortune sent by God are like conquerors who intrude through a wide breach in the wall (Job 30:14; cf. vv. 11-12, similarly also 16:14).[25] The almost total destruction of Benjamin left a gap in the tribes much like a breach in a wall (Jgs. 21:15). 2 S. 6:8 (= 1 Ch. 13:11) refers to the destruction of an individual (simultaneously an explanation of the place-name *pereṣ 'uzzā'*).[26] According to Isa. 30:13, the people's iniquity will lead to their destruction like a break that leads to the collapse of a high wall (*pereṣ* here may refer to a cracked section of wall, a notion more commensurate with the following participles[27]). In a reverse fashion, a person can step into a breach *('āmaḏ)* to defend against the advancing enemy and prevent the city, which is already under siege, from being taken. This particular notion is applied metaphorically to the leading figures and groups that preserved Israel in threatening situations from God's destruction (Moses in Ps. 106:23; Phinehas in Sir. 45:23; cf. Nu. 25:6-13) or whose actions should have protected Israel (prophets in Ezk. 13:5 [where *'ālâ* probably

---

22. On Neh. 2:13; 4:1(7), see I.1 above; on Am. 4:3 see *HAL,* III, 973.
23. → סכך *sāḵaḵ,* §IV.1; Veijola, 167-68.
24. Concerning *millô',* → מלא *mālē',* VIII, 307.
25. See II.1 above.
26. See in this regard II.1 above.
27. H. Wildberger, *Jesaja. BK* X/3 (1982), 1174-75; *HAL,* III, 973.

refers to damage to the upper part of the wall], and in a general sense in Ezk. 22:30; cf. also the exhortation in 4QMª fr. 11 2:13[28]).

When *pereṣ* is understood as a breach at birth, as discussed earlier, the name of the clan is construed accordingly. The same name occurs elsewhere in the Pentateuch, the Chronicler's History, and in the book of Ruth (cf. Gen. 46:12; Nu. 26:20-21; 1 Ch. 2:4-5; Neh. 11:4, though also *parṣî* in Nu. 26:20). It is questionable, however, whether this interpretation was the original meaning of the name. Rather, the reference may be to the notion of spreading out or expanding, perhaps as a parental wish at birth.[29] 2 S. 5:20 (1 Ch. 14:11) refers to the breaking through of water[30] (whence the explanation of the place-name *ba'al pᵉrāṣîm* [in Isa. 28:21 *har pᵉrāṣîm*]; but this explanation is doubtless also secondary[31]). The noun *pereṣ* probably refers in Ps. 144:14 to "accident, misfortune" in a very general sense (though Ziegler takes a different view based on text-critical considerations of the entire verse). CD 1:18-19 is difficult to interpret. It may be saying that the apostates (1:12) search figuratively for a breach in the wall in order to escape the obligations of the covenant (cf. 1:20), though the reference may also be to actively malicious deeds in the sense of destruction or tearing down.[32]

The idea behind the noun *pārîṣ* is that of breaking out of the existing laws, whence the translation "outlaw, criminal" (cf. Akk. *parriṣu*[33]). It is used in this literal sense in Jer. 7:11 (within a metaphorical comparison[34]), Ezk. 18:10 (in apposition to *bēn*), Ps. 17:4 (albeit amid textual problems[35]), and 1QH 6:20. In Ezk. 7:22 it refers to foreign powers who lay waste to Jerusalem, in Dnl. 11:14 to rebels among the people, and in Isa. 35:9 metaphorically to ravenous beasts.

Conrad

---

28. M. Baillet, *DJD*, VII, 31.
29. For other interpretations see *HAL*, III, 973.
30. See II.1 above.
31. Concerning the original form of this name, see Borée, 52-53, 95-97.
32. In this regard see Glück.
33. See I.2 above.
34. W. Rudolph, *Jeremia*. *HAT* I/12 (³1968), 53-54.
35. See *BHS;* also H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59* (Eng. trans. 1987), 244, 248.

פָּרַק pāraq; פֶּרֶק pereq

Contents: I. Etymology. II. 1. OT Occurrences; 2. Phraseology, Synonyms, Antithetical Parallels; 3. LXX. III. OT Use: 1. Pulling Off, Tearing Away in General; 2. Breaking the Yoke; 3. Rings in Ex. 32. IV. Noun *pereq*.

I. Etymology. The verb is attested in both East and West Semitic, the oldest witnesses being Akk. *parāqu*, "separate, detach," and Ugar. *prq*, "break."[1] Additional relationships include those with Middle Heb. *pāraq*, "separate,"[2] Aram. *prq*, "destroy, break open";[3] cf. *p^eruq* in Dnl. 4:24(Eng. 27): "shatter (expunge) your sins with righteousness" (the influence of Biblical Hebrew is unmistakable and seems to have been leveled here); Jewish Aram. *p^eraq*, "redeem, tear to pieces";[4] Syr. *p^eraq*, "loose, rescue";[5] Sam. *frq*, "save, rescue";[6] Arab. *faraqa*, "separate, divide"; cf. *farq*, "separation";[7] Eth. *faraqa*, "free, rescue."[8] According to *HAL*, the basic meaning is "split, separate."

II. 1. *OT Occurrences*. In the OT the verb occurs 4 times in the qal, 3 in the piel, and 3 in the hithpael; these occurrences include 4 in the Pentateuch, 2 in the Psalms, and once each in the Dtr History, Ezekiel, Lamentations, and Zechariah. The noun *pereq* occurs twice.

2. *Phraseology, Synonyms, Antithetical Parallels*. It is worth noting that objects are introduced once each with *'eṯ* and *min*. Subjects include the wind (once), persons (7 times), and God (twice). Parallel terms include *šbr* (once) and *ṭrp* (once), while an antithesis is *nṣl* (once). The semantic scope encompasses "tear away," "tear up," accompanied by great force such that the goal can be negative (destructive) or positive (saving). Although it is difficult to distinguish between the qal and piel,[9] stylistic considerations suggest that certain distinctions in aspect obtain at this level.

---

pāraq. P. Auffret, "Note sur la structure littéraire du Psaume CXXXVI," *VT* 27 (1977) 1-12; P. A. Giguère, "'Le son d'une brise légère': Un progrès dans la représentation de Dieu. Une étude de 1 R 19,11-12," *EgT* 2 (1971) 177-84; J. Lust, "Elijah and the Theophany on Mount Horeb," *BETL* 41 (1976) 91-100; L. V. Meyer, "An Allegory Concerning the Monarchy: Zech 11:4-17; 13:7-9," *Scripture in History and Theology. FS J. C. Rylaarsdam. PTMS* 17 (1977), 225-40; I. Willi-Plein, *Prophetie am Ende: Untersuchungen zu Sacharja 9–14. BBB* 42 (1974); J. van Zijl, "The Root פרק in Targum Isaiah," *JNSL* 2 (1972) 60-73.

1. *AHw*, II, 829b; *UT*, no. 2118.2.
2. *WTM*, IV, 135-36.3.
3. *KAI* 222B.34.
4. *ANH* (Frankfurt, ²1922), 352.
5. *LexSyr*, 605.
6. R. Macuch, *Grammatik des samaritanischen Aramäisch* (Berlin/New York, 1982), 401.
7. Wehr, 708.
8. *LexLingAeth*, 1354.
9. *HP*, 176.

3. *LXX*. The LXX renders this term with *eklýein* (once), *dialýein* (once), *lytroústhai* (3 times), *ekstréphein* (once), and *periaireísthai* (3 times); the rendering *ekdikeín* (Ezk. 19:12) probably derives from a different original source.

III. OT Use. All these occurrences seem to come from a later period, probably from the exilic or postexilic period. Since no diachronic comparison is possible, one is best advised to concentrate on individual passages in which the meaning is clearly discernible.

1. *Pulling Off, Tearing Away in General.* Few commentators question the masc. *m*ᵉ*pārēq* after *rûaḥ* in 1 K. 19:11. M. Rehm finds a later insertion here that (so runs the argument) already considered Yahweh to be personified in the *rûaḥ*.[10] The parallel *m*ᵉ*šabbēr* helps in determining the meaning. The context shows that a weighty theophany is being portrayed in that a powerful *(g*ᵉ*ḏôlâ),* torrential (*ḥāzāq*, probably to be read as fem.) storm precedes Yahweh. This storm, understood here as a specific form of God's presence, not only splits *(m*ᵉ*šabbēr)* rocks, but also shatters and rends *(m*ᵉ*pārēq)* mountains *(hārîm).* The term *prq* describes the violent activity of shattering.

As far as sheer violence and destructive force is concerned, Ezk. 19:12 matches the passage just discussed. Although the verse as a whole presents interpretive difficulties,[11] *prq* hithpael is rarely questioned.[12] If *prq* was part of the original text, but especially if it was chosen specifically for a secondary addendum, this relatively rare word was doubtless chosen because of its specific content. The destruction of the ruler described in Ezk. 19:10-14 as a "vine" is to be portrayed as drastically as possible: it was torn out in fury, and the searing east wind withered its fruit. An additional intensification is provided by *hiṯpār*ᵉ*qû*, "its fruit was stripped off."[13] The destructive fury, the notion of tearing away and shredding, emerges clearly in this passage.

Zech. 11:16 is also a disputed passage in that some interpreters assume *parsêhen,* the object of *prq* piel, is to be emended. The worthless shepherd allegedly devours *('kl)* the flesh of the fat animals, tearing their pieces off (presupposing the emendation to *pereṣ*[14] or the presence of an Aramaism, *p*ᵉ*ras*[15]). Yet even Keil[16] already sensed the greed with which the worthless shepherd tears off even the hoofs in order to get the last edible parts.[17] Since the context apparently describes the worthlessness of the shepherd with increasing severity (v. 16 contains a concentration of verbs in the piel), the piel as

---

10. *Das erste Buch der Könige* (Würzburg, 1979), 188.

11. W. Eichrodt, *Ezekiel. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1970), 250; G. Fohrer, *Ezechiel. HAT* I/13 (²1955), 105.

12. By, e.g., W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), 391, 397-98, who is prompted by metrical considerations to assume the presence of a later, interpretive insertion.

13. On the passive use of the hithpael, see *GK*, §54g.

14. So F. Horst, *Die zwölf kleinen Propheten. HAT* I/14 (²1954), 252.

15. Thus the view of many since E. Sellin, *Das Zwölfprophetenbuch. KAT* XII/1 (1922), 516-17.

16. *Twelve Minor Prophets. KD,* 359, 378.

17. *AuS,* VI, 230; B. Otzen, *Studien über Deuterosacharja. AcThD* 6 (1964), 259-60.

well as the position at the end of the enumeration show that *prq* piel constitutes the negative high point, and the notion of shredding and unrestrained tearing asunder the commensurate activity.

Ps. 7:2-3(1-2) describes the cry of a petitioner who fears a lion will tear him apart *(ṭrp)*. The text of v. 3b(2b), containing the ptcp. *pōrēq,* is the object of discussions involving both the presumed meaning of the words and the meter. For example, Duhm and Briggs follow the LXX in suggesting *'ên pōrēq,*[18] while Leveen suggests *yiprōq.*[19] Dahood argues that vv. 2b and 3b are parallel; he thus associates *napšî* with *yiprōq* to get a pure four-stress colon in which *prq* and *ṭrp* correspond.[20] The parallel already confirms that *prq* means "tear apart." In any event, the danger of being torn apart doubtless represents the opposite of being rescued *(nṣl)*.

2. *Breaking the Yoke.* The "yoke" frequently symbolizes human repression, both political and social.[21] The most frequent term used to describe the "breaking of a yoke" is *šbr* (e.g., Jer. 2:20; 5:5; 28:2,4,11), though other verbs, such as *qll* (1 K. 12:9), *ḥbl* (Isa. 10:27), *sûr* (Isa. 14:25), and *ḥtt* (Isa. 9:3[4]) can describe various nuances of the same idea. In Gen. 27:40, probably a later addendum, the qal of *prq* takes on this task. Esau will allegedly smash his brother's yoke from his own neck *(ûpāraqtā 'ullô mē'al),* presupposing a liberating action. If one compares the other verbs and considers the uses of *prq* already discussed, this action is probably to be understood as a particularly violent self-liberation.

This passage provides a transition to those in which *prq* refers to the kind of snatching out or tearing away associated with rescue. Lam. 5:8 can be understood in this context. The speakers lament having to bear the consequences of their ancestors' sins and endure the rule of slaves. Unlike Prov. 30:22 and Isa. 3:4, this passage does not refer to a reversal of the social order; the term *'ᵃḇāḏîm* refers rather to Babylonian officials who carry out a harsh regency *(mšl)*. This idea is paralleled by the hopelessness of any change: *pōrēq 'ên.* There is no one who might snatch the Judeans forcefully from the clutches of their overlords. The choice of the participial form underscores the aspect of an ongoing hopeless condition.

Ps. 136:24 describes such rescue from oppression by enemies *(ṣar)*. Comparable formulations are readily found: *yš' min* (Ps. 44:8[7]) or *mîyāḏ* (Neh. 9:27b), *mlṭ mîyāḏ* (Job 6:23a), *g'l mîyāḏ* (Ps. 107:2), or construed nominally as *'ēzer min* (Dt. 33:7; cf. also Ps. 60:13[11]). The specific semantic nuance of *prq* can only be determined contextually. Ps. 136 mentions the kings who threatened the Israelites during their wilderness wanderings (vv. 17-20), and the humiliation (v. 23) endured presumably during the exile. In such a context, *prq* describes how the Israelites were snatched or torn away from life-threatening (military-political) situations.

---

18. B. Duhm, *Die Psalmen. KHC* XIV (²1922), 29; C. A. Briggs, *Critical and Exegetical Comm. on the Book of Psalms. ICC,* 2 vols. (1906-1907), I, 57.

19. J. Leveen, "The Textual Problems of Psalm VII," *VT* 16 (1966) 440.

20. M. Dahood, *Psalms 1–50. AB* 16 (1965), 41.

21. → עֹל *'ōl.*

3. *Rings in Ex. 32.* The use of *prq* in Ex. 32 seems to have been prompted exclusively by the intention to evoke a kind of wild, unrestrained action. Someone (in the present context, Aaron) tells the Israelites to collect all the gold. According to Ex. 32:2, the people were to "take off" (*prq* piel) the earrings of the women, sons, and daughters; according to v. 3, the people really do "tear off"(*prq* hithpael)[22] this jewelry. Since in and of itself *prq* generally refers to a violent action, and since the piel or hithpael has been chosen here, it was probably the crowd's importunate wildness that prompted the choice of this word. Comparison shows that the purpose of this singular use is to provide an accentuation clearly deviating from comparable passages, since the usual verbs for "taking off rings" *(nezem)* include *lqḥ* (Gen. 24:22), *ntn* (Gen. 35:4; Jgs. 8:24), *sûr* hiphil (Isa. 3:18,21), and *šlk* hiphil (Jgs. 8:25). Although the passages from the book of Judges criticizing the production of cultic objects are interesting substantive parallels, their word choices are not as base and harsh as in Ex. 32:2,3,24.

IV. Noun *pereq.* In Nah. 3:1 the noun *pereq* refers to the booty or plunder snatched away from the enemy and brought into safekeeping. Ob. 14 is disputed: "Do not stand at the *pereq.*" The usual rendering is "crossroads" or "crossing" (so Syr. and Tg.); other suggestions include "narrow pass" and "escape route."[23]

Reiterer

---

22. M. Noth, *Exodus. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1962), 247, suggests that the author is using a vulgar form of expression here.
23. W. Rudolph, *Joel, Amos, Obadja, Jona. KAT* XIII/2 (1971), 304-5; H. W. Wolff, *Obadiah and Jonah* (Eng. trans. 1986), 32, 37, 55.

פרר *prr;* פור *pwr*

Contents: I. Etymology. II. 1. Occurrences; 2. Objects; 3. Synonyms. III. 1. Secular Usage; 2. Theological Usage. IV. *hēpēr bᵉrîṯ:* 1. Occurrences; 2. Translation Problems; 3. Earliest Occurrence, Origin of the Formula; 4. Unequivocal Theological Occurrences; 5. Which *bᵉrîṯ?* V. Sirach. VI. Qumran. VII. LXX.

---

prr. E. Kutsch, "פרר *prr* hi., to break," *TLOT,* II, 1031-32.

On I: M. Dahood, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography IX," *Bibl* 52 (1971) 337-56; H. L. Ginsberg, *The Legend of King Keret. BASORSup* 2-3 (New Haven, 1946); J. Gray, *The KRT Text in the Literature of Ras Shamra. DMOA* 5 (²1964); W. A. Ward, "Observations on the Egyptian Biconsonantal Root *pꜣ**," *Orient and Occident. FS C. H. Gordon. AOAT* 22 (1973), 207-12, esp. 207-9.

I. Etymology. Lexicons generally distinguish two independent roots: *prr* I (hiphil, hophal) with the secondary form (?) *pwr* (hiphil only), and *prr* II (qal, polel, hithpolel, pilpel, with extremely different meanings).[1] Although a secondary form *pwr* to *prr* (I) would not be unusual,[2] *'āpîr* in Ps. 89:34(Eng. 33) is probably a scribal error from *'āsîr* (cf. *BHK, BHS*), and in the two other passages (Ezk. 17:19; Ps. 33:10), *hēpēr* might have been mistakenly written as *hēpîr*. Some scholars (esp. Ward) associate *prr* II with Middle Heb., Jewish Aram. *pirpēr,* "twitch, move back and forth," and with Syr. *parpar,* "flutter, tremble," and Arab. *farfara,* "shake."[3] The existence of Akk. *parāru* especially militates against two independent roots: G, "become detached, come off," D "dissolve," N "disperse," Ntn "run back and forth (aimlessly)."[4] The basis for both "roots" is the biconsonantal *pr,* "separate."[5] Whereas a partial reduplication is at work in *pārar,* a full reduplication of the biconsonantal basis is at work in (Middle Heb., Jewish Aram./Syr., Arab.) *pirpēr/parpar.*

A semantic connection also obtains between the widely differing meanings of *prr* in the Semitic languages (so Kienast): in the basic stem (referring to persons and animals) "continue on, go on, flee,"[6] (referring to things) "fall off, become detached, become limp" (Akk.); in the causative: "scare away, frighten" (Syr.), as well as "loosen, detach," i.e., "dissolve, declare invalid" (referring to *bryt*), thus Heb. *prr* I (Qumran, Middle Heb.; Jewish Aram.); factitive: "cause to flee, go away," i.e., "disperse, distribute," so Akkadian D, "frighten," Heb. "*prr* II," polel, pilpel, "loosen, detach," i.e., "dissolve" (fetters), "smash, break up," Akkadian D, Hebrew hiphil (Qumran), "break into small pieces," Middle Heb. piel and pilpel[7] (derivatives: *pērûr,* "breaking into small pieces, crumbs"; *pērûrā',* "flour paste"); pass.: Jewish Aram. ithpalpel; extensive: "run back and forth, cause to sway," thus Heb. "*prr* II" polel; passive: hithpolel, Akk. ND: "scatter" (said of people), "break apart, shatter" (intransitive, said of jars); Akk. Ntn, "run about aimlessly."

The 4 OT occurrences of "*prr* II" can be classified nicely here: Isa. 24:19 (qal and hithpolel: "sway to and fro," the earth as subj.); Ps. 74:13 (poel: "stir up, frighten," the sea as obj.); similarly in Job 16:12 (pilpel, Job as obj.[8]). The meaning "twitch, jerk" of-

---

On IV: F. C. Fensham, "Malediction and Benediction in Ancient Near Eastern Vassal-Treaties and the OT," *ZAW* 74 (1962) 1-9, esp. 4-5; E. Kutsch, "בְּרִית *b^erît* obligation," *TLOT,* I, 256-66; W. Thiel, "Hēfēr b^erīt: Zum Bundbrechen im AT," *VT* 20 (1970) 214-29.

On VI: M. Baillet, "Un recueil liturgique de Qumrân, Grotte 4: 'Les paroles des luminaires,'" *RB* 68 (1961) 195-250, esp. 208-11; M. Delcor, *Les hymnes de Qumran (Hodayot)* (Paris, 1962).

1. Exceptions include *GesTh,* II, 1131; *WTM,* IV, 131-32, 140.

2. See *GK,* §67v; *BLe,* 438; G. Bergsträsser, *Intro. to the Semitic Languages* (Eng. trans. 1983), §27q.

3. See Wehr, 708.

4. See *AHw,* II, 829-30.

5. Personal communication from B. Kienast.

6. See Ugar. *KTU* 1.19, III, 14.28, referring to birds, cf. *WUS,* no. 2259; *UT,* no. 2120; contra *TO,* I, 450[t]; also Syr.

7. *WTM,* IV, 140.

8. Not "shake, tug someone about," contra *HAL,* III, 975b; overlooked by Even-Shoshan.

ten adduced here is limited to relatively late, four-consonantal verb constructions, full reduplications (Middle Heb. *pirpēr;* Syr. *parpar;* Arab. *farfara*). Two somewhat puzzling Ugaritic parallels use *prr* (G stem) apparently to mean "to break."[9] In Deir ʿAlla II.17 the Aram. noun *pr* occurs, which according to Hoftijzer and van der Kooij is to be translated "foolishness, mental deficiency" (cf. Akk. *parāru,* "fall off, go limp").[10] The meaning of *prr* hithpolel in Samaritan, "wake up,"[11] is probably influenced by *pirpēr,* "twitch, jerk." Finally, the sense of the one occurrence in Punic is obscure.[12]

II. 1. *Occurrences.* The verb *prr (pwr)* occurs 52 times in the OT (discounting Ps. 89:34[33], which requires emendation), including 45 times in the hiphil, 3 in the hophal (Isa. 8:10; Jer. 33:21; Zech. 11:11), and 4 in stems of "*prr* II" (see above).

The occurrences of "*prr* II" as well as the hiphil/hophal forms of *prr* are generally exilic-postexilic. The earliest texts are 2 S. 15:34; 17:14 (in the accession narrative); and 1 K. 15:19 (par. 2 Ch. 16:3). Preexilic occurrences include Prov. 15:22; Isa. 14:27; 8:10 (hophal: Isaiah?); Ezk. 16:59; 17:15,16,18,19. Exilic passages include Jgs. 2:1 (Dtr); Isa. 33:8; 44:25; Jer. 11:10; 14:21; Ezk. 44:7; all 13 occurrences in the Pentateuch belong to the early postexilic period and are limited to (in part earlier) legal material related to P (Gen. 17:14 [P^{G}?]; Lev. 26:15,44 [H]; Nu. 15:31; 30:9,13[3 times],14,16[twice] [8,12,13,15]; Dt. 31:16,20); also Ps. 33:10; 85:5(4); 5th century: Ezr. 4:5; 9:14; Neh. 4:9(15); 4th century: Job 5:12; 15:4; 40:8; later: 2 Ch. 16:3 (par. 1 K. 15:19); Ps. 119:126; Eccl. 12:5; Isa. 24:5; Jer. 33:20,21 (probably the latest occurrence); Zech. 11:10,11.

2. *Objects.* In contrast to Akkadian usage, though also to Middle Hebrew, *prr* hiphil in the meaning "dissolve/thwart" or "break/declare invalid" takes exclusively nonconcrete objects: a plan *(ʿēṣâ),* 2 S. 15:34; 17:14 (of Ahithophel); Isa. 14:27; also hophal, Isa. 8:10; the counsel of nations *(gôyim),* Ps. 33:10; omens *(ʾōṯôṯ)* of the diviners *(baddîm),* Isa. 44:25; Yahweh's justice *(mišpāṭ),* Job 40:8, or his instruction/law *(tôrâ),* Ps. 119:126; commandment(s) *(miṣwâ/miṣwôṯ),* Nu. 15:31; Ezr. 9:14; fear (of God) *(yirʾâ),* Job 15:4 (Eliphaz's reproach to Job); Yahweh's wrath *(kaʿas),* Ps. 85:5(4) (in a petition to Yahweh); family ties *(ʾaḥ^{a}wâ),* Zech. 11:14; a vow *(nēḏer),* Nu. 30:9,13(twice),14,16(8,12,13,15) (declare invalid). The object in no fewer than 18 passages is *b^{e}rîṯ* ("covenant" or "obligation"), always (excepting 1 K. 15:19 par. 2 Ch. 16:3 and Ezk. 17:15,16,18) in reference to Yahweh's *b^{e}rîṯ.*

3. *Synonyms.* Synonymous expressions include despising *(bzh)* an oath *(ʾālâ,* Ezk. 16:59; 17:18,19) or Yahweh's word *(dāḇār,* Nu. 15:31); changing *(ḥlp)* statutes *(ḥôq)* and transgressing *(ʿbr)* laws *(tôrôṯ),* Isa. 24:5; rejecting *(mʾs)* witnesses *(ʿēḏîm,* cj.; MT *ʿārîm*), Isa. 33:8; and finally pursuing other gods *(hlk ʾaḥ^{a}rê)* to serve them *(ʿbd),* Jer.

---

9. *KTU* 1.2, I, 12-13 (par. *ṯbr*); 1.15, III, 29-30 (par. *ṯny*); cf. *CML,* 78-79; Gray, 20; Ginsberg, 23-24; Dahood, 335; idem, *RSP,* I, 316-17, nos. 469, 470; uncertain: *UT,* no. 2131.

10. *ATDA,* 246.

11. *LOT,* II, 581.

12. *DNSI,* II, 944.

11:10. Among the 3 occurrences in the passive (hophal), Isa. 8:10 is to be translated as "be thwarted, annulled," with a human plan *('ēṣâ)* standing contrary to Yahweh's historical plan; Jer. 33:21 and Zech. 11:11 refer to Yahweh's *b^erîṯ*.

III. 1. *Secular Usage.* At first glance, only two passages do not stand in a theological context. Here we encounter the so-called intransitive hiphil in the sense of "plans" *(maḥ^ašāḇôṯ)* without counsel "collapsing" (*prr* hiphil inf. abs., Prov. 15:22). This peculiar form has probably been influenced by the notion of the act-consequence paradigm. That is, plans made without counsel collapse of their own accord or "cause themselves" to fail. In Eccl. 12:5 the caper berry similarly "breaks into pieces" or, more concretely, "bursts."[13] Within a series of metaphors in this poem about aging, the notion of "bursting" refers to the suddenness of death. Since no other passives occur in v. 5, a conjecture (*w^eṯuppar;* cf. *BHS*) is not necessary, and even less an emendation to *tip̄reh* ("bears fruit") or *tip̄raḥ* ("blooms");[14] the metaphor would then be utterly inappropriate.

2. *Theological Usage.* The theological context of the remaining occurrences is unmistakable. David succeeds in "thwarting" Ahithophel's dangerous plan through Hushai (2 S. 15:34) only because Yahweh himself ordained it or effected it through Hushai (2 S. 17:14). By contrast, Isaiah insists that it is impossible for human beings to thwart that which Yahweh plans (*y'ṣ,* Isa. 14:27 hiphil; cf. 8:10 hophal). The plan *('ēṣâ)* to rebuild the temple can be thwarted only temporarily (Ezr. 4:5). By contrast, God is indeed able to frustrate the plan foreign adversaries have made against the construction of the wall under Nehemiah (Neh. 4:9[15]), just as he frustrates the (adversarial) counsel of the nations (*'^aṣaṯ gôyim//maḥš^eḇôṯ 'ammîm,* Ps. 33:10). According to Eliphaz (Job 5:12), God also frustrates the "devices of the crafty" *(maḥš^eḇôṯ '^arûmîm,* hiphil ptcp.), and according to Deutero-Isaiah (44:25) the omens of the magicians (*'ōṯôṯ baddîm,* hiphil ptcp.). Eliphaz accuses Job of breaking into pieces the fear *(yir'â)* of God through all his arguing (Job 15:4), and God himself asks Job (40:8) whether he is trying to break God's own justice (*mišpāṭî*), i.e., God's own just claim over against Job, by claiming to be right himself *(ṣdq)*.

In regulations affecting the validity of vows (Nu. 30:2-17[1-16] P^s), *prr* in the hiphil means "invalidate, nullify." A husband can nullify his wife's vow *(nēḏer)* or oath *(š^eḇu'â)* of abstention on the day he hears of it such that Yahweh offers a remittance for the woman (30:9,13[8,12]). The husband cannot legitimately invalidate it at a later date, and he himself ultimately bears the responsibility for it (30:14,16[13,15]). 11QT 54 incorporates these stipulations.

IV. *hēp̄ēr b^erîṯ.*

1. *Occurrences.* In no fewer than 21 texts, *prr* in the hiphil takes the obj. *b^erîṯ* ("covenant," "obligation"): Gen. 17:14; Lev. 26:15,44; Dt. 31:16,20; Jgs. 2:1; 1 K. 15:19

---

13. See *KBL*², 781.

14. Contra H. W. Hertzberg, *Der Prediger. KAT* XVII/4-5 (1963), 207.

(par. 2 Ch. 16:3); Isa. 24:5; 33:8; Jer. 11:10; 14:21; 31:32; 33:20; Ezk. 16:59; 17:15,16,18,19; 44:7; Zech. 11:10. Twice *b^erîṯ* is the subject of *prr* hophal (Jer. 33:21; Zech. 11:11). Altogether, the passages mentioned encompass approximately half the occurrences. Four other passages in which *prr* in the hiphil takes various other objects presuppose the tradition of God's *b^erîṯ* (Nu. 15:31, *miṣwāṯî;* Ps. 119:109, *tôrāṯ^ekā;* Zech. 11:14, *'aḥ^awâ;* Ps. 85:5[4], *ka'as^ekā*).

2. *Translation Problems.* The exact determination of the meaning of *prr* in the hiphil is especially difficult because both the etymology and the meaning of *b^erîṯ* itself are unclear (either "contract/covenant" or "obligation"). Even though etymologically the term *b^erîṯ* does mean approximately "obligation" (Kutsch), the preps. *bên* ("between") and *'ēṯ* ("with") show that the reference is also to a relationship between two persons, a situation not entirely evoked by the rendering "obligation." The following discussion can thus refer to the notion of "covenant." From a purely etymological perspective, the expression *hēpēr b^erîṯ* could mean both "unilaterally nullify an obligation/commitment" and "violate a contract, declare a contract invalid [as no longer binding]." Akkadian synonyms,[15] however, suggest that the latter meaning is intended here: *mamīta parāṣu,* "to break an oath [i.e., a sworn contract]," as well as *riksa wuššuru,* "not adhere to a contract."[16] The OT synonyms for *hēpēr b^erîṯ,* however, can be reconciled with both translations: one can "desecrate" a *b^erîṯ* (*ḥll* piel, Ps. 55:21[20]; 89:35[34]), "forget" it (*škḥ,* Dt. 4:31), "violate" it (*'br,* Dt. 17:2), "renounce" it (*n'r* piel, Ps. 89:40[39]; *m's,* 2 K. 17:15), "corrupt" it (*šḥt,* Mal. 2:8), and "abandon" it (*'zb,* Dt. 29:24[25]).

3. *Earliest Occurrence, Origin of the Formula.* 1 K. 15:19 (par. 2 Ch. 16:3) is the earliest occurrence of *hēpēr b^erîṯ* and probably the only occurrence in a nontheological context; as such, it is of significance for determining the original meaning of the expression. In view of an early *b^erîṯ* between Aram and Judah, Asa of Judah asks King Ben-hadad of Aram to "break" his *b^erîṯ* with *('ēṯ)* Baasha of Israel so that the latter might withdraw from Judah (lit. "from me"). Ben-hadad's *b^erîṯ* with Baasha was apparently a nonaggression treaty[17] that Ben-hadad, motivated also by a bribe, then does indeed break. In this context, then, *hēpēr b^erîṯ* refers to "unilaterally breaking off a contractual relationship" (Thiel); and at least here the notion of *b^erîṯ* has taken on the sense of "covenant, alliance, agreement."[18]

The question must remain open whether the formula *hēpēr b^erîṯ* was itself rooted "in the contractual legal praxis of the ancient Near East."[19] Given their theological contexts, the other passages Thiel adduces in support (Ezk. 17:15-19; Isa. 33:8) are not particularly persuasive. Ezk. 17:15-19 mentions 4 times that the king of Judah

---

15. See M. Weinfeld, ברית *b^erîṯ (b^erîth),* II, 261-62.
16. See *AHw,* II, 832; *PRU,* IV, 36, 23-24; also *AHw,* III, 1485b.
17. See Thiel, 215.
18. See even Kutsch, 259.
19. Thiel, 215.

(Zedekiah) "broke" the *b^erîṯ* with Nebuchadnezzar. Even though its genesis[20] can be understood as the making of a vassal contract, *bᵉrîṯ* refers here — in contrast to 1 K. 15:19 — not so much to a "covenant" or "alliance" as to an "obligation" that Nebuchadnezzar imposed on Zedekiah and to which the latter then had to bind himself with an oath. Here the expression *hēpēr bᵉrîṯ* means "(unilaterally) dissolve an obligation" rather than "break a contract." Precisely the passages Thiel claims speak so unequivocally about a vassal contract (Ezk. 17:16,18) stand in a text that has been inserted between vv. 15 and 19,[21] an insertion qualifying Zedekiah's breach of the *bᵉrîṯ* (v. 15) by interpreting it as a breach of oath toward Nebuchadnezzar. By contrast, the broken *bᵉrîṯ* in v. 19, which originally immediately followed v. 15, appears as Yahweh's *bᵉrîṯ*, and certainly not only because Zedekiah entered this *bᵉrîṯ* before Yahweh and guaranteed it.[22] Hence Zedekiah's behavior does indeed imply a breach of trust toward Yahweh as well, who stands behind these events.

Isa. 33:8 lacks sufficient concreteness, and only when the unit (vv. 7-9) is viewed in an extremely isolated context can one speak of a "breach of contract" in a secular sense; the context itself (cf. vv. 10-16) suggests rather a breach of the "covenant" with God.[23]

4. *Unequivocal Theological Occurrences.* The remaining 15 occurrences exhibit clear theological usage. Although the formula is not found in the Dtn law, it does occur in Ezekiel (44:7) and his school (16:59), in (secondary) Dtr passages (Dt. 31:16,20; Jgs. 2:1), in Dtr texts in Jeremiah (Jer. 11:10; 14:21; 31:32), in the exilic concluding chapter to H (Lev. 26:15,44), in what is probably an expansion in P (Gen. 17:14), and in late prophetic texts (Isa. 24:5; Jer. 33:20; Zech. 11:10,14). The primary subject is (the) Israelites; only in Isa. 24:5 is it the inhabitants of the earth in general and in 4 passages Yahweh himself (Lev. 26:44; Jgs. 2:1; Jer. 14:21; Zech. 11:10). The first two passages preclude any possibility that Yahweh might break his own *bᵉrîṯ* with Israel. Similarly, according to Jer. 33:21 Yahweh's *bᵉrîṯ* with David can be broken (*prr* hophal) as little as can Yahweh's *bᵉrîṯ* with day and night (Jer. 33:20; maintain MT *tāpērû*[24]). These passages (cf. also Jer. 14:21) are apparently trying to assuage fears that arose during the exile. Zech. 11:10 and 14 are difficult to understand. Here Yahweh annuls his *bᵉrîṯ* with all the peoples (cf. also v. 11 hophal) or annuls the "family ties" (*'aḥᵃwâ*) between Judah and Israel.

5. *Which bᵉrîṯ?* As in Zech. 11:10, it is not always clear which *bᵉrîṯ* of Yahweh is meant. Such is the case in Ezk. 44:7, which mentions how the *bᵉrîṯ* was broken by admitting uncircumcised foreigners to the sanctuary and by the resulting profanation of the temple. Ezekiel himself speaks metaphorically about a marriage "covenant" with Jerusalem (Ezk. 16:8), a "covenant" that according to the Ezekiel school Jerusalem

20. So Thiel, 216.
21. See H. F. Fuhs, *Ezechiel 1–24. NEB* ([2]1988), 88.
22. See Thiel, 216.
23. See H. Wildberger, *Jesaja (28–39). BK* X/3 (1982), 1299.
24. See *HAL*, III, 975a.

broke by engaging in idolatry (16:59). Lev. 26:44 (cf. v. 42) is probably referring to the *b^erîṯ* with Abraham (Gen. 17), though a *bᵉrîṯ* with Israel brought out from Egypt cannot be entirely excluded (cf. v. 45 and Jer. 31:32). By contrast, the broken *bᵉrîṯ* postulated hypothetically in Lev. 26:15 refers to a disregard of Yahweh's commandments (concretely: of those of H itself; v. 14); here Lev. 26 presupposes the catastrophe of the exile. Gen. 17:14 refers to the Abraham *bᵉrîṯ*, which each individual male Israelite can break by refusing circumcision (their sign), resulting in exclusion from the people (a sacral legal principle). Jgs. 2:1 apparently refers to the patriarchal covenant that Yahweh swore never to break. In the surrounding context of the Song of Moses (Dt. 31:16-22), Yahweh predicts to Moses that Israel will break the *bᵉrîṯ*, referring probably to that of Horeb, by engaging in idolatry after entering the land (Dt. 31:16,20). This passage also presupposes the exile. The three passages in Jeremiah referring to the Horeb "covenant"(?) (11:10; 14:21; 31:32) all stand in a Dtr context.[25] Jer. 11:9-14 refers to a (current) conspiracy among the people of Judah and Jerusalem (against Yahweh; v. 9) consisting in a return to the sins of the fathers, a refusal of obedience, and (concretely) in idolatry (v. 10a). The author qualifies this situation as a breach of the Yahweh *bᵉrîṯ* with the ("their") ancestors (cf. also Jgs. 2:1), simultaneously viewing the "covenantal" breach of the house of Judah as one with that of the (fallen) house of Israel (v. 10b). The promise of a new *bᵉrîṯ* in Jer. 31:31-34 addresses the same content: the house of Israel, the house of Judah, the Yahweh *bᵉrîṯ* made with their fathers that they have now broken (vv. 31-32), a *bᵉrîṯ* peculiarly associated with the exodus from Egypt (v. 32; cf. also Jgs. 2:1 [Dtr]). Now, however, the author mentions not only the actual breach of the *bᵉrîṯ* but also the promise of a new, permanent *bᵉrîṯ* (v. 31) that will no longer need any written "document" *(tôrâ)*. The third passage in Jeremiah (14:21) stands in a "lament of the people" (Jer. 14:19-22) in connection with what is known as the "drought liturgy" (14:1–15:4 [Dtr][26]). This lament of the people invokes Yahweh's (Dtr) promise in Jgs. 2:1 according to which he would never again nullify his *bᵉrîṯ*: "Remember and do not break your *bᵉrîṯ* with us" (Jer. 14:21b). The petition adduces Yahweh's own name and the throne of his glory, i.e., Jerusalem, as motivation (v. 21a; cf. 3:17; 17:12). In view of the divine judgment, this lament acknowledges that Israel has broken the *bᵉrîṯ* and fears Yahweh himself will now nullify it; at the same time, however, the new *bᵉrîṯ* of 31:31-34, which will replace the first one, is not yet in view.

V. Sirach. The only occurrence of *prr* hiphil in Sirach (41:19b) is found in the Masada text: "Be ashamed of 'breaking' an oath *('lh)* or agreement *(bryt)*."

VI. Qumran. The term occurs 13 times in the Qumran writings, always in the hiphil, and with the exception of CD 1:20 always in prayers. 4QDibHam 5:8 rejects the notion that God has rejected the descendants of Jacob (Israel) in order to destroy them

25. Cf. Thiel, 217-21; Schreiner, *Jeremia. NEB* (1984/93), 80, 96-97, 187-88.
26. A different view is taken by W. Rudolph, *Jeremia. HAT* I/12 (³1968), 97.

(*klh* piel) and break *(lhpr)* his "covenant" *(bryt)* with them *('tm)*. Similarly, in 4QDibHam 6:7-8 the community asserts that it has not "broken [God's] covenant" *(lhpr brytkh)* even in the face of "trials and scourges" from God (cf. also 4Q381 69:8 and 4Q418 131:4). By contrast, the apostates (cf. CD 1:12ff.) transgressed (*'br* hiphil) the "covenant" *(bryt)* and broke (*prr* hiphil) the "precept" *(ḥwq)* (CD 1:20; cf. 11QT 59:8). 4QShir^{b} (511) frs. 63-64 III:5 condemns all who break the covenant. The eschatological new creation will be accompanied by God "breaking asunder" (*prr* hiphil) "things anciently established" *(qyymy qdm)* (1QH 13:12). 11QT 54 picks up the stipulations in Nu. 30 (see above). The two passages with arrows (*ḥṣym* or *ḥṣy šḥt*) as the subject (1QH 2:26; 3:27) are not using a separate stem, *commovere,*[27] but rather the meaning "destroy"[28] (cf. also Akk. D: "smash, crush"). In 1QH fr. 3:5 the hithpolel (inf. *mhtprr*) together with "forms of dust" *(yṣr 'pr)* means "break into pieces."[29]

VII. LXX. The LXX usually translates *prr* in the hiphil as *diaskedázein.* In Dnl. 3:34 (Theodotion/LXX), the prayer of Azariah (3:25-45) cites Jer. 14:21c almost verbatim: *kaí mḗ diaskedásēs tḗn diathḗkēn sou* (or *sou tḗn diathḗkēn*).

Ruppert

27. Contra Kuhn, 181.
28. See Kutsch, 259.
29. Kuhn takes a different view, suggesting *commovere.*

פָּרַשׂ *pāraś;* מִפְרָשׂ *miprāś*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences. II. OT Use: 1. Spreading Out Clothing, etc.; 2. Stretching Out One's Hands; 3. Scattering. III. 1. Qumran; 2. LXX.

I. 1. *Etymology.* Etymologically, *prś* is related to Ugar. *prš,* "stretch out,"[1] Jewish Aram. *p*^{e}*raś/p*^{e}*ras,* "spread out, stretch," Mandaic "spread out, stretch out," and Arab.

1. See M. Dietrich, O. Loretz, and J. Sanmartín, "Der keilalphabetische Šumma 12bn-Text RS 24,247+265+268+328," *UF* 7 (1975) 139; in *KTU* 1.4, I, 35, the meaning of *d prš bbr* is uncertain, perhaps "cover with radiant metal"; see A. van Selms, "A Guest-Room for Ilu and Its Furniture," *UF* 7 (1975) 472-73; M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, "Die sieben Kunstwerke des Schmiedegottes in KTU 1.4 I23-43," *UF* 10 (1978) 61.

faraša, "spread out, extend." It is doubtful whether OSA *mfrśt*, "fence" (or similar),[2] belongs here (so *HAL*).[3]

2. *Occurrences.* The verb occurs in the OT 56 times in the qal, once in the niphal (plus 2 cjs.), and 8 times in the piel. Two of the occurrences in the qal, however, are to be ascribed to *pāras*, "break, break into small pieces" (Lam. 4:4; Mic. 3:3). The subst. *miprāś* occurs once with the meaning "sail" (Ezk. 27:7) and once as a verbal substantive with the meaning "spreading (out)" (Job 36:29).

II. OT Use.

1. *Spreading Out Clothing, etc.* In the qal *pāraś* means especially "to spread out." One can spread a cloth or garment (*beged*, Nu. 4:6-8,11,13) over the "Most Holy" (the ark) during transport during the desert wanderings (cf. *k*[e]*sûy*, "covering," 4:14). A person can spread a "cloth" (*śimlâ*, Dt. 22:17) before the elders to prove that a woman was a virgin at her marriage (cf. 11QT 65:13) or on the ground and then collect golden earrings on it as booty (Jgs. 8:25). A person spreads a "covering" *(sāmāḵ)* over the opening of the well, or a "bedcover" *(maḵbēr)* over the face of King Hazael to suffocate him to death (2 K. 8:15). Tents are spread (Ex. 40:19), as are sails (Isa. 33:23) and nets (*rešeṯ*, Ps. 140:6[Eng. 5]; Prov. 29:5; Lam. 1:13; Ezk. 12:13; 17:20; 19:8; 32:3; Hos. 5:1; 7:12; *miḵmereṯ*, Isa. 19:8). Similarly, a bird can spread its wings (Job 39:26; a metaphor for God's steadfast concern in Dt. 32:11; for the enemy in Jer. 48:40; 49:22). In the holy of holies the cherubim spread out their wings over the cover (*kappōreṯ*, Ex. 25:20; 37:9; 1 K. 6:27; 8:7; 1 Ch. 28:18; 2 Ch. 3:13; 5:8; 11QT 7:11; cf. 4QDibHam[a] 6:8 and 4Q405 fr. 23 2:5). A scroll is spread out (Ezk. 2:10), as is a letter (2 K. 19:14; Isa. 37:14). Metaphorically, a fool "flaunts" folly (*'iwweleṯ*, Prov. 13:16). God spreads out the clouds (Ps. 105:39; probably also Job 26:9, where the MT reads *pršz*). Dawn spreads over the mountains (Joel 2:2).

A man symbolically spreads the tip of his cloak over a woman to take her as his wife (Ruth 3:9, allegorically with reference to God and Jerusalem in Ezk. 16:8). A similar custom has been attested among the Arabs from early times all the way into the present.[4]

2. *Stretching Out One's Hands.* With the obj. *yāḏ*, the verb *pāraś* means to "stretch out one's hand." The enemy stretches out his hand to seize Jerusalem's precious treasures (Lam. 1:10).[5] Prov. 31:20 says that the capable wife extends (opens) her hand

---

2. Biella, 411; Beeston, 46.

3. A. F. L. Beeston, "On the Correspondence of Hebrew *s* to ESA *s2*," *JSS* 22 (1977) 57, mentions the verb *frś*, "spread, disseminate, announce."

4. Bibliog. in G. Gerleman, *Ruth/Das Hohelied. BK* XVIII ([2]1981), 32; and E. F. Campbell, *Ruth. AB* 7 (1975), 123.

5. So W. Rudolph, *Das Buch Ruth; Das Hohelied; Die Klagelieder. KAT* XVII/1-3 (1962), 205, 207; a different view is taken by O. Plöger, *Die Klagelieder. HAT* I/18 ([2]1969), 133: "lay his hand on."

(kap) to the poor and reaches out her hand *(šālaḥ yāḏ)* to the needy to help them. To indicate a gesture of prayer, *pāraś* is often used with *kappayim* as its object. Petitioners spread the palms of their hands upward as if to receive God's gifts or to express their desire for union.[6] As soon as Moses stretches out his hands in prayer to Yahweh, the storm ceases (Ex. 9:29,33). Ezra spreads out his hands to Yahweh and confesses the people's sins (Ezr. 9:5). Zophar admonishes Job to stretch out his hands toward God that God may extirpate his guilt (Job 11:13). Solomon spreads out his hands toward heaven (1 K. 8:22,54; 2 Ch. 6:12-13) and asks God to grant the prayers made with hands outstretched toward the temple (1 K. 8:38 par. 2 Ch. 6:29). In Ps. 44, a lament of the people, the people assure God that they have never spread out their hands to a strange god (v. 21[20]). The piel is used in the same sense. No matter how earnestly the Israelites stretch out their hands in prayer, God will not listen to them, for their hands are covered with blood (Isa. 1:15). Zion cries out for mercy with outstretched hands (Jer. 4:31), but no one consoles her (Lam. 1:17, here *yāḏayim*). Psalmists may stretch out their hands in their distress (Ps. 143:6). Swimmers can also stretch out their hands (Isa. 25:11), or God can stretch out his hands as an invitation to his people (Isa. 65:2).

3. *Scattering.* The meaning "scatter" easily emerges from the notion of spreading out. According to Ps. 68:15(14), Shaddai "scattered kings." The same meaning probably also applies to Zech. 2:10(6), where those whom God has scattered in all directions *(rûḥôṯ)* are exhorted to flee from the land of the north.[7]

The only certain occurrence of the niphal also belongs in this context (Ezk. 17:21): Zedekiah is conquered and the people "scattered to every wind." Ezk. 34:12 should probably also be read *niprāśôṯ* instead of MT *niprāšôṯ;* i.e., the shepherd gathers in the scattered sheep.

III. 1. *Qumran.* In the Qumran writings *prś* is used primarily in connection with the spreading of nets. Wicked persons spread their nets against the petitioner or against the good (1QH 2:29; 3:26; 5:8; probably also 1QH fr. 3:4). 1QSb 5:29 seems to refer to hasty orders that "spread" out quickly across the earth. According to 4Q381 46:4, God's glory and beauty have spread over the entire world (cf. Ps. 105:39).

2. *LXX.* The LXX uses several widely differing translations for *pāraś*. The most frequent involve compounds with *petánnymi (dia-, ek-, ana-),* then also *ekteínein, diateínein,* also *epibállein,* and *anaptýssein.* The meaning "scatter" is rendered only once with *diaspeírein;* in Zech. 2:10(6) the LXX uses *synágein,* and in Ps. 68:15(14) *diastéllein.* Other translations are used in isolated instances.

Ringgren

---

6. O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 1–12. OTL* (Eng. trans. [2]1983), 33.

7. W. Rudolph, *Haggai — Sacharja 1–8 — Sacharja 9–14 — Maleachi. KAT* XIII/4 (1976), 86-87, translates "I will make room for you."

פָּרָשׁ *pārāš*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology; 2. Meaning; 3. LXX; 4. OT Occurrences. II. OT Contexts: 1. Royal Power; 2. Military Contexts; 3. Transport; 4. Honorific Title and Symbol. III. Qumran.

I. 1. *Etymology.* Despite various attempts at an explanation, the etymology of *pārāš* is still obscure, which is why both *BLe* and *HAL* view it as a primary noun.[1] The hypothesis deriving it from the name of the country Persia is untenable.[2] Nor does a proposed derivation from *pāraś* in the sense of "to spread (one's legs)" bring us any closer.[3]

The term *pārāš* appears in Northwest Semitic (Old and Imperial Aramaic, Nabatean, Palmyrene)[4] and in Old South Arabic[5] with the meanings "horse," "rider," "equestrian troop." The earliest occurrence is in the Zakir inscription as part of the formulation *lrkb [w]lprš,* with *prš* referring to horses or equestrian troops in contradistinction to *rkb.*[6] In its Palmyrene and Nabatean occurrences, *prš* means "rider."[7] This semantic breadth is attested in later Semitic occurrences as well, e.g., in Syr. *parrāšā,* "horse," Mandaic, "rider,"[8] Arab. *faras,* "horse," and *fāris,* "rider." The Ugar. *prs,* "trained horse," is also comparable.[9]

2. *Meaning.* The obscure etymology of *pārāš* contributes to the obscurity surrounding its meaning. Some scholars assume the basic meaning "horse" and the semantic develop-

---

pārāš. D. R. Ap-Thomas, "All the King's Horses," *Proclamation and Presence. FS G. H. Davies* (Richmond, 1970), 135-51; W. R. Arnold, "The Word פָּרָשׁ in the OT," *JBL* 24 (1905) 45-53; M. A. Beek, "The Meaning of the Expression 'The Chariots and the Horsemen of Israel' (2 Kings 2:12)," *OTS* 17 (1972) 1-10; F. C. Fensham, "Ruitery of strydwabemanning in Exodus," *NGTT* 19 (1978) 195-99; K. Galling, "Der Ehrenname Elisas und die Entrückung Elias," *ZTK* 53 (1956) 129-48; M. L. Henry, "Pferd," *BHHW,* III, 1438-39; Y. Ikeda, "Solomon's Trade in Horses and Chariots in Its International Setting," in T. Ishida, ed., *Studies in the Period of David and Solomon* (Winona Lake, Ind., 1982), 215-38; W. Mayer, "Gedanken zum Einsatz von Streitwagen und Reitern in neuassyrischer Zeit," *UF* 10 (1978) 175-86; S. Mowinckel, "Drive and/or Ride in O.T.," *VT* 12 (1962) 278-99; A. Rüthy, "Reiter, Reiterei," *BHHW,* III, 1584-85; H. C. Schmitt, *Elisa* (Gütersloh, 1972), esp. 111-15; H. Weippert, "Pferd und Streitwagen," *BRL*², 249-55.

1. *BLe,* §61m; *HAL,* III, 977.
2. P. Jensen, "Kiš," *ZA* 15 (1900) 230; Ap-Thomas, 146-47.
3. Ap-Thomas, 148-49.
4. Sources in *DNSI,* II, 945.
5. See Beeston, 46.
6. *KAI* 202B.2; *ANET,* 656; *DNSI,* II, 945.
7. *DNSI,* II, 945.
8. *LexSyr,* 609; *MdD,* 363.
9. See M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, "Einzelfragen zu Wörtern aus den ugaritischen Mythen und Wirtschaftstexten," *FS C. F. A. Schaeffer. UF* 11 (1979) 189-91, 193.

ment to "equestrian troop."[10] Others view "equestrian troop" as the basic meaning and "horse" as secondary.[11] Although *HAL* assumes the presence of two types of substantives,[12] a *qaṭal* type (pl. *p^e^rāšîm*) meaning "horse" and a *qaṭṭāl* type (pl. *pārāšîm*) meaning "rider," it does admit that the two types can no longer really be distinguished. To that extent, only a survey of individual passages can help clarify the meaning of *pārāš*.

It is not always clear whether *pārāš* refers to chariot horses or riders (1 S. 13:5; 1 K. 20:20). Its meaning emerges in expressions such as *ba'^a^lê happārāšîm* (2 S. 1:6) and *śārê pārāšîm* (1 K. 9:22; 2 Ch. 8:9) in which *pārāš* itself refers to the horse, and the chariot warrior or equestrian troop is indicated by the construct.

A similarly unequivocal expression is *pārāšîm rôḵ^e^ḇê sûsîm* (Ezk. 23:6,12), in which *pārāš* refers to the rider, or parallels between *pārāšîm* and *'îš raglî* (2 S. 8:4), *pārāš* and *rômēh qešeṯ* (Jer. 4:29), and *pārāšîm* and *(śar) ḥayil* (Ezr. 8:22; Neh. 2:9).

In several passages the parallel *sûsîm* and *pārāšîm* refer to horse and rider (Ezk. 38:4; Hos. 1:7), whereas in other passages the same parallel refers to riding horses and chariot horses (Ezk. 27:14; Joel 2:4).

On the other hand, *sûs* and *pārāš* are not simply synonyms. Galling suggests that in contradistinction to *sûs*, *pārāš* is actually a technical term from the northern Syrian-Aramean sphere understood as a foreign term in Israel, though we cannot determine whether this technical term refers to the breed or to the training of these horses or to both.[13] A distinction between *sûs* and *pārāš* can be assumed when the two terms are used together in series. Such is the case in the series *sûs — reḵeḇ — pārāšîm* (Ex. 14:23; 15:19; Isa. 31:1; Ezk. 26:7), where → סוס *sûs* represents the overriding concept "equestrian troop," which consists of chariots and their teams.[14] This distinction is particularly clear in Ex. 15:19, *sûs par'ōh b^e^riḵbô ûḇ^e^pārāšāyw*, i.e., the equestrian troop *(sûs)* consists of chariots and draft horses. A comparison of the OT combination of *reḵeḇ* and *sûs* with that of *reḵeḇ* and *pārāš* reveals that the latter occurs far more frequently than the former (25 occurrences to 5),[15] suggesting that *pārāš* rather than *sûs* refers to the draft or chariot horse. This distinction may also explain the presence of two different terms for "horse" in OT Hebrew to express different semantic nuances. Similarly, *pārāš*, unlike *sûs*, also appears in construct expressions with *ṣemeḏ*, "team" (Isa. 21:7,9). Still, it should be pointed out that *sûs* can also refer to the chariot horse while the parallel *pārāš* refers to the riding horse (Jer. 46:4).

The combination *reḵeḇ — pārāš*, however, can refer not only to the chariot and team but in some passages also to the chariot and rider. Such is the case in Isa. 22:7;[16] Ex.

---

10. Arnold, 45ff., 50ff.; Galling, 133; Mowinckel, 290; Ap-Thomas, 143ff.
11. *KBL*², 783; for an overview of dictionary treatments, see Fensham, 195-96.
12. *HAL*, III, 977; cf. *GesB*, 663.
13. Galling, 134-35.
14. Galling, 133 n. 2; → סוס *sûs*, X, 183.
15. J. Krašovec, *Der Merismus im Biblisch-Hebräischen und Nordwestsemitischen. BietOr* 33 (1977), 145.
16. See H. Donner, *Israel unter den Völkern. SVT* 11 (1964), 126; a different view is taken by H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27* (Eng. trans. 1997), 351.

14:28, where *rekeb* and *pārāš* are summarized collectively by *ḥayil*;[17] and 2 S. 10:18 (cf. 1 Ch. 19:18).[18]

3. *LXX*. The LXX translates *pārāš* with various terms depending on whether the reference is to "horse" or "rider." Hence it translates *hippeús* in Ex. 14:9,17; Josh. 24:6; 1 S. 13:5, etc.; *híppos* in 1 K. 1:5; 10:26; Isa. 22:6, etc.; *anabátai* in Ex. 14:23,26,28; 15:19; 2 Ch. 12:3; Isa. 36:9; Jer. 4:29; and *hippárchai* in 2 S. 1:6.

4. *OT Occurrences*. The appearance of *pārāš* in the Pentateuch (11 times in Genesis; 7 in Exodus), the Dtr History (once in Joshua, twice in 1 Samuel, 3 times in 2 Samuel, 7 in 1 Kings, 4 in 2 Kings), the prophets (7 times in Isaiah, twice in Jeremiah, 6 times in Ezekiel, once each in Hosea, Nahum, Joel, and Habbakuk), the apocalyptic Daniel (once), and the Chronicler's History (11 times) reveals that the term is used primarily in narrative texts. Not surprisingly, the term does not occur in either the Psalms or the wisdom writings.

II. OT Contexts.

1. *Royal Power*. The earliest occurrence of *pārāš* is in the succession narrative, which says of Adonijah: *wayyaʿaś lô rekeb ûpārāšîm waḥamiššîm ʾîš rāṣîm lepānāyw* (1 K. 1:5). The combination of the three terms *rekeb, pārāš,* and *ʾîš* shows that the horses served as chariot horses, especially given that horses themselves were not actually ridden until later.[19] A comparable passage is 1 S. 8:11, according to which one of the rights of the king was to take the sons of the Israelites: *weśām lô bemerkabtô ûbepārāšāyw werāṣû lipnê merkabtô*. Here too the horses are chariot horses, whereas the soldiers are simple foot soldiers. A comparison of 1 K. 1:5 and 1 S. 8:11 with 2 S. 15:1, a text similarly dating to the early monarchy *(wayyaʿaś lô ʾabšālôm merkābâ wesusîm waḥamiššîm ʾîš rāṣîm lepānāyw),* shows that these passages use *sûs* and *pārāš* synonymously. Later addenda to the Dtr History emphasize Solomon's horse possessions as a sign of his power and wealth, pointing out that he had four [NRSV forty; see comms.] thousand stalls for his chariot horses (1 K. 5:6[4:26]) or that he owned twelve thousand horses (1 K. 10:26).

2. *Military Contexts*. In the overwhelming majority of instances, *pārāš* occurs in military contexts, which are indicated also by the military technical terms used parallel with *pārāš,* such as *ḥayil* (Ex. 14:9,17; 2 Ch. 16:8; Ezr. 8:22; Neh. 2:9; Ezk. 38:4), *rekeb* (Gen. 50:9; Ex. 14:9,17-18,23,26; 15:19; Josh. 24:6; 1 S. 13:5; 2 S. 1:6; 10:18; 1 K. 9:22; 10:26; 2 K. 18:24; 1 Ch. 18:4; 2 Ch. 1:14; 12:3; 16:8; Isa. 21:7; 22:7; 31:1; 36:9; Ezk. 26:7; Dnl. 11:40), *rômēh qešet* (Jer. 4:29), *ʿam* (Ezk. 26:7), and *qešet, ḥereb,* and *milḥāmâ* (Hos. 1:7). Chariots and horses are part of the equipment of a king, who

---

17. B. S. Childs, *Exodus. OTL* (1974), 217.

18. See also H. W. Hertzberg, *I & II Samuel. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1964), 302.

19. → סוס *sûs,* X, 182; R. Ficker, "רכב *rkb* to ride, drive," *TLOT,* III, 1238; Fensham, 196-98; Mayer, 181-82.

also functions as a field general, or of a bellicose nation. Pharaoh pursues the Israelites with chariots and equestrian troops (Ex. 14:9,17-18,23,26; 15:19; Josh. 24:6). According to 1 S. 13:5, when the Philistines mustered to attack Israel they had three [NRSV thirty; cf. comms.] thousand chariots and six thousand horses (cf. also 2 S. 1:6). After David captured this Philistine force, he hamstrung all the chariot horses (2 S. 8:4 par. 1 Ch. 18:4). He also destroyed the chariots and riders of the Arameans (2 S. 10:18). Among the kings of Israel, Solomon is allegedly the first who had chariots and equestrian troops (1 K. 5:6[4:26]; 9:22); indeed, he even stationed these troops in chariot cities (1 K. 10:26 par. 2 Ch. 1:14; 8:6; 9:25). No other passages apart from these mention equestrian troops in Israel in a military context, making it unlikely that the Israelite army itself had any equestrian troops.[20]

Among Israel's neighbors, Neo-Assyrian sources offer especially useful information about the development of equestrian troops in the 1st millennium. The existence of military horsemen is mentioned beginning with Tukulti-Ninurta II (888-884), the reference being first of all to tandems of which one rider was armed with a bow, the other with a lance, sword, or shield. Armored riders rendering the shield unnecessary appear first under Tiglath-Pileser III (745-727). The rider was a mounted infantry soldier whose most important tasks were security, reconnaissance, and pursuit, though he also functioned as a courier and bodyguard. The significance of the chariot, which developed into an increasingly heavy piece of equipment, was eventually eclipsed by that of equestrian troops.[21]

It was generally non-Israelite powers who engaged horses and chariots. In its revolt against Assyria, Judah counted on the Egyptian chariots and equestrian troops (2 K. 18:24; Isa. 31:1), and when Pharaoh Shishak besieged Jerusalem, he engaged chariots, chariot warriors, and soldiers (2 Ch. 12:3). Nebuchadnezzar engaged horses, chariots, equestrian troops, and an army against Tyre (Ezk. 26:7,10). Such military power is attributed not only to the Egyptians (Jer. 46:4) and Assyrians (Ezk. 23:6,12), but also to the Cushites and Libyans (2 Ch. 16:8) as well as to unnamed enemies of Israel (Jer. 4:29). After his defeat by King Ahab of Israel, Ben-hadad of Aram fled *'al sûs ûpārāšîm* (1 K. 20:20), though the meaning of this expression is not entirely clear. Some translators refer the prep. *'al* only to *sûs*, "on a horse and horsemen along with him."[22] Others refer it to both terms, "escaped together with his chariot horses,"[23] or "because of his chariot- and cavalry-horses."[24]

3. *Transport.* In a relatively few passages, *pārāš* refers to a "draft horse" as indicated by the parallel use of *rekeḇ ḥ^{a}môr* and *rekeḇ gāmāl* with *ṣemeḏ pārāšîm* in Isa.

---

20. *Rüthy,* 1584; Ficker, *TLOT,* III, 1238.

21. See Mayer, 181-86.

22. J. Gray, *I & II Kings. OTL* ([2]1970), 420; cf. A. van den Born, *Koningen. BOT* (1958), 118-19.

23. E. Würthwein, *Die Bücher der Könige,* part 2: *1. Kön. 17–2. Kön. 25. ATD* XI/2 (1984), 234; cf. Mowinckel, 292-93.

24. Arnold, 49.

21:7,9. Although the context involves Babylon, it is not clear from the passage whether this enumeration of diverse means of transportation refers to the baggage train of the conquerors transporting booty away, to the procession of those who have been liberated and now return home, or to the departure of an army.[25] Similarly, within the context of the farm parable in Isa. 28:23-29, the term *pārāš* refers to the draft animals that pull the carts used for milling grain (v. 28).

4. *Honorific Title and Symbol.* The use of *pārāš* as an honorific title emerges from 2 K. 2:12 and 13:14, the older of these related texts actually being 13:14. Here Elisha (and, secondarily in 2:12, Elijah) is called *reḵeḇ yiśrā'ēl ûpārāšāyw,* a title showing that there was an Elisha tradition celebrating him as a participant in the wars against the Arameans and equating his paranormal talents with the capabilities of a fighting force.[26] The expression can be translated as "chariot troops [collective sg.] of Israel and their teams."[27] There is no reason to assume that this title is related to Aramean religious traditions (so Galling)[28] or to Exodus (so Beek). A more likely motif is that of horses and carts in Zech. 6:1-8.[29]

Like *sûs,* the term *pārāš* also symbolizes trust in human power instead of in Yahweh (Isa. 31:1-3). The enumeration *sûsîm — reḵeḇ — pārāšîm* in association with Egyptian power recalls the portrayal of Pharaoh's power in Ex. 14:23 and 15:19, and of Nebuchadnezzar's power in Ezk. 26:7; from the perspective of these passages, the formulation in Isa. 31:1 acquires a negative connotation by enumerating the means of power at the disposal of Israel's enemies. The mention of this military power stands opposed to the Holy One of Israel to whom Israel does not look in its time of need.

III. Qumran. All 6 occurrences in Qumran are found in 1QM. Reference is made to cavalry divisions (*siḏrê pārāšîm,* 6:8-9) and to the armored and armed "horsemen of the army" (*pārāšê hasereḵ,* 6:14) who fight to the finish (vv. 15-17) and are compared with the clouds and dew that cover the earth (12:9). The formulation *pārāšîm 'al reḵeḇ* (6:11) shows that *pārāš* also refers to the chariot warrior.

Niehr

25. O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 13–39. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1974), 127; Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27,* 322-23.
26. Würthwein, *Könige,* 365.
27. Galling, 135.
28. Schmitt, 111-15.
29. Schmitt, 114.

פָּשַׁט *pāšaṭ*

Contents: I. Etymology. II. OT Usage: 1. Occurrences; 2. Qal and Hiphil: a. Take Off Clothes; b. Shed Skin; c. Skin, Flay; d. Take Off, Move Out; 3. Piel; 4. Hithpael. III. 1. LXX; 2. Qumran.

I. Etymology. Apart from Akk. *pašāṭu(m),* "extirpate, eradicate,"[1] *pšṭ* usually means "stretch out" or "spread out," e.g., Mand. *pšṭ,* "stretch out oneself/a hand/etc., spread out,"[2] Syr. *pšṭ,* "stretch out oneself/a hand/etc., make/be straight, explain,"[3] Jewish Aram. *p*ᵉ*šîṭ,* "simple" (i.e., not folded or doubled),[4] Arab. *basaṭa,* "spread out, make even, stretch out." *HAL* suggests "spread out" as the possible basic meaning, from which in Hebrew the meanings "take off (clothes),"[5] and "make an attack [an army that spreads out]," "rush out,"[6] may have developed.

II. OT Usage.

1. *Occurrences.* The verb *pšṭ* occurs 43 times in the OT (24 times in the qal, 3 in the piel, 15 in the hiphil, and once in the hithpael).

2. *Qal and Hiphil.* The intransitive qal means "undress, shed skin," while the transitive hiphil means "strip someone, skin, flay."

a. *Take Off Clothes.* In the meaning "take off (clothes)," *pšṭ* has a plural form (with a suffix or in the construct state) of *beged* as its object in 11 passages (Lev. 6:4[Eng. 11]; 16:23; Nu. 20:26,28; 1 S. 19:24; Neh. 4:17[23]; Job 22:6; Ezk. 16:39; 23:26; 26:16; 44:19) and in 7 it stands next to → לבשׁ *lāḇēš* as its opposite (Lev. 6:4[11]; 16:23; Nu. 20:26,28; Cant. 5:3; Ezk. 26:16; 44:19). It is quite natural that an everyday act such as taking off clothes is portrayed only in special situations.

When Joseph came to his brothers, they "stripped him of his robe *(kuttontô)*" (Gen. 37:23). Nehemiah tells how he, his brothers, his servants, and the guards set a good example while guarding the wall construction by not taking off their clothes even at night (Neh. 4:17[23]). The girl who refuses to let in her beloved argues: "I have put off my undergarment *(kuttontî);* how can I put it on again? I have bathed my feet; how can I soil them?" (Cant. 5:3). That is, it would be somewhat inconvenient for the girl to get up again. In order to seize David, who had fled to the prophets in *nāwōṯ* or *nāyôṯ,*[7] three times Saul sends messengers who fall into a prophetic frenzy. When Saul himself goes there and also falls into such a frenzy, "he too *(gam-hû')* stripped off his clothes" (1 S.

1. *AHw,* II, 844.
2. *MdD,* 382.
3. *LexSyr,* 611.
4. *DNSI,* II, 946.
5. *HAL,* III, 980; see II.2a-c,3,4 below.
6. See II.2.d below.
7. → נוה *nāweh,* IX, 275.

19:18-24, here v. 24). The expression *gam-hû'* is striking in that the text says nothing about the messengers also having taken off their clothes. The oversight may derive simply from narrative carelessness prompted by the other three times that *gam-hû* occurs in the text (vv. 22a,23b,24a) and by *gam-hemmâ* in vv. 20b,21ab.[8]

In Mic. 2:8aβ, an admittedly corrupt text, the prophet reproaches the unjust rulers, saying "you strip 'the robe' from the peaceful" (so *BHS*). And Job receives the reproach, "you have exacted pledges from your family for no reason, and stripped the naked of their clothing" (22:6), whereby the "naked" probably refer to the "poorly clothed needy."[9] In one drastic image in Mic. 3:2b-3a, the prophet accuses the Jerusalem authorities of flaying human beings: "who tear *(gzl)* the skin from them, and the flesh off their bones; who eat the flesh of my people, flay their skin off them (*pšṭ* hiph.), break their bones in pieces." Here v. 3aα² ("flay their skin off them") is a later explication of v. 2bα ("who tear the skin from them").[10]

After defeating Saul, the Philistines plunder the dead[11] and strip off Saul's armor (1 S. 31:9a par. 1 Ch. 10:9a). In Hos. 2:5(3) Yahweh declares that if his faithless wife Israel does not change her ways, he will "strip her 'naked' [by which] he indicates his own freedom from the obligation to clothe her, a legal obligation the man assumes with marriage (Ex 21:10)";[12] i.e., he is divorcing her. According to Ezk. 16, Yahweh indirectly divorces the harlot Jerusalem by announcing he will deliver her into the hands of her lovers, "and they shall strip you of your clothes *(wᵉhipšîṭû 'ôṯāḵ)* and take your beautiful objects" (v. 39aβ).[13] In a slightly varied form *(wᵉhipšîṭûḵ)*, this sentence is repeated in 23:26, where it was added to the announcement of judgment on the harlot Oholibah = Jerusalem.[14]

The act of taking off clothes is mentioned as a mourning custom in Ezk. 26:16 in connection with Tyre, where the princes step down from their thrones and take off their clothes, and in Isa. 32:11b, where Jerusalem's "women who are at ease" are challenged to "strip [*pᵉšōṭâ*, either second-person fem. pl. impv. in *-â*,[15] or an Aramaic form[16]] and make yourselves bare, and put sackcloth on your loins." Job's lament that God "has stripped my glory *(kᵉḇôḏî)* from me" (19:9a) is commensurate with the figurative OT understanding of honor, righteousness, or salvation as a garment (cf. 29:14).[17]

Within the cultic sphere, the verb *pšṭ* occurs in connection with the transfer of office. Yahweh orders Moses to strip Aaron of his vestments (*pšṭ* hiphil) before the latter's death and to put them on his oldest son, Eleazar (Nu. 20:26a), something Moses

---

8. Contra H. J. Stoebe, *Das erste Buch Samuelis. KAT* VIII/1 (1973), 365, who translates "he even stripped off his clothes."

9. G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 356.

10. See H. W. Wolff, *Micah* (Eng. trans. 1990), 91, 98-99.

11. See 3 below.

12. H. W. Wolff, *Hosea. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1974), 34.

13. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), 340, 346.

14. Ibid., 489.

15. Meyer, §68.2e.

16. *HAL*, III, 980b.

17. See also → לבשׁ *lāḇēš*, §III.3.a (VII, 464).

proceeds to do (v. 28aα). The verb also appears in connection with prophylaxis. In what is probably a post-Ezekelian section, Ezk. 44:6-31,[18] the priests receive the following instructions: "When they [the priests] go out into the outer court to the people, they shall remove the vestments in which they have been ministering . . . and they shall put on other garments so that they may not communicate holiness to the people with their vestments" (v. 19), since the condition of holiness is dangerous. For the same reason, the priest is to take off the garment he put on before removing the ashes of the burnt offering from the altar (Lev. 6:4a[11a]); Aaron, i.e., the high priest, is to do the same thing at the end of the atonement ritual (16:23).

b. *Shed Skin.* Nah. 3:15b-17a address Nineveh: "Multiply like the locust *(yeleq),* multiply like the grasshopper *('arbeh)!* You increased your merchants more than the stars of the heavens. The locust *(yeleq)* sheds its skin *(pāšaṭ)* and flies away. Your guards are like grasshoppers *('arbeh),* your scribes like swarms of locusts *(gôḇ).*" The sentence "the locust sheds its skin and flies away" (v. 16b) does not fit in this context[19] and is probably a gloss. According to A. S. van der Woude,[20] the purpose of the gloss is to point out how the *yeleq,* a leaping animal hatched from an egg, flies away as an *'arbeh,* a winged animal, after it sheds its skin for the last time.[21]

c. *Skin, Flay.* The verb *pšṭ* hiphil is the technical term for the flaying of sacrificial animals and occurs 3 times as such in the OT. The ritual for the oxen *'ōlâ* in Lev. 1:3-9 stipulates in v. 6 that the person making the sacrifice, in this case the layperson, was to flay the *'ōlâ;* such applied to every *'ōlâ.* The flaying is also explicitly mentioned because the skin subsequently went to the priest attending each private *'ōlâ* (Lev. 7:8).[22] According to 2 Ch. 29:34, after Hezekiah's cultic reform the people presented so many burnt offerings that the priests were unable to skin them all, and the Levites had to help. Here, then, the skinning was the task of the priests themselves. At Josiah's Passover celebration, the Levites slaughtered the sacrificial animals and then skinned them (2 Ch. 35:11). It is unclear whether the Chronicler understands them as performing auxiliary service here as well (cf. 30:17),[23] service the Chronicler explicitly attributes to the Levites' greater zeal over against the priests (29:34; 30:17), or whether he considers such slaughtering to be the task of the Levites at Passover.[24]

d. *Take Off, Move Out.* In 15 OT passages *pšṭ* occurs in the qal as an expression for a military undertaking (in 5 instances followed by a form of *nkh* hiphil, Jgs. 9:44b; 20:37; 1 S. 27:8; 30:1; 2 Ch. 25:13). Nevertheless, H. Tawil's assertion that Heb. *pšṭ* in military contexts means "to raid/commit a razzia" is an overgeneralization.[25] The ac-

18. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1983), 463.

19. Contra W. Rudolph, *Micha — Nahum — Habakuk — Zephanja. KAT* XIII/3 (1975), 186, who identifies it as a proverb.

20. *Jona. Nahum. POT* (1978), 124.

21. See *AuS,* II, 347.

22. See R. Rendtorff, *Leviticus. BK* III/1 (1985), 54.

23. See also J. Milgrom, *Studies in Levitical Terminology,* I (Berkeley, 1970), 60 n. 226.

24. So W. Rudolph, *Chronikbücher. HAT* I/21 (1955), 329.

25. H. Tawil, "Two Notes on the Treaty Terminology of the Sefire Inscriptions," *CBQ* 42 (1980) 31 n. 9.

count of Abimelech's attack on Shechem enumerates the following sequence: *pšṭ* (no prep. obj.), *'md* (Jgs. 9:44a), and only then the actual battle against the city and its defeat (v. 45a). In 1 Ch. 14:9,13, the Chronicler replaced the verb in his source (2 S. 5:18,22), *nṭš* niphal, "deploy themselves for battle,"[26] with *pšṭ* (*bᵉ'ēmeq rᵉpā'îm* or *bā'ēmeq*). Similarly, *pāšaṭ gᵉdûḏ baḥûṣ* (Hos. 7:1) is probably to be translated "and the robbers raid without."[27] Elsewhere *pšṭ* can indeed be rendered as "to raid": Jgs. 9:33,44b (with *'al*, on Shechem or the people in the fields); 20:37 (with *'el*, on Gibeah); 1 S. 23:27 (with *'al*, on the land, i.e., on Saul's territory); 27:8 (with *'el*, on the Geshurites and others); 27:10 (Achish asks David: *'ān pᵉšaṭṭem hayyôm*, "Against whom have you made a raid today?"); 30:1,14 (with *'el* [in v. 14 replaced by *'al*], on the southern region); Job 1:17 (with *'al*, on Job's camels); 2 Ch. 25:13 and 28:18 (with *bᵉ*, on cities). A uniform rendering for all 15 occurrences might be "move out (against)."

3. *Piel*. In the three passages where *pšṭ* is used in the piel — and only here — *pšṭ* is used as a resultative in the sense of "make (completely) stripped," i.e., "plunder."[28] On the morning after defeating Saul, the Philistines plunder the dead (1 S. 31:8a par. 1 Ch. 10:8a). Although the Israelites withdrew in the face of the Philistines, David's elite warrior Eleazar stood his ground and defeated the Philistines; "then the people came back to him — but only to plunder the dead" (2 S. 23:9-10, here v. 10b; see *BHS*).

4. *Hithpael*. According to 1 S. 18:4, Jonathan seals his *bᵉrîṯ* with David (v. 3) by stripping off his robe *(mᵉ'îl)* and giving it to David; here the hithpael of *pšṭ* means approximately "give away" one's clothing "as a sign of unqualified attachment."[29]

III. 1. *LXX*. The LXX offers various translations for *pšṭ*, generally translating the qal and hiphil in the meaning "take off clothes" (also the hithpael) as *ekdýein* or *ekdýesthai* (17 times), in the meaning "skin, flay" as *(ek)deírein*, and "take off, move out," often as *epitíthesthai* (7 times).

2. *Qumran*. This verb appears 5 times in the Qumran writings and consistently follows OT usage. 11QT 34:9 mentions the flaying of sacrificial animals. According to 1QM 7:2, after the decisive eschatological battle those who strip the dead *(mapšîṭê haḥᵃlālîm)* are to be no older than thirty. The niphal ptcp. *nipšāṭîm* occurs in 1QM 8:6 and 17:10 in reference to the departure of military columns of the eschatological army. 11QT 32:13 is unclear.

Schmoldt

---

26. → נטשׁ *nāṭaš*, IX, 408.
27. So Wolff, *Hosea*, 106.
28. *HP*, 203.
29. Stoebe, *Samuelis*, 348; cf. *GK*, §54f.

פָּשַׁע *pāša'*; פֶּשַׁע *peša'*

Contents: I. The Concept of Sin in the Ancient Near East: 1. Egypt; 2. Mesopotamia; 3. Ugarit. II. 1. Comparisons, Distribution; 2. Theses (L. Köhler, R. Knierim). III. Basic Meaning: 1. Unequivocal Passages; 2. Ex. 22:8(Eng. 9); 3. Additional Passages; 4. Proverbs; 5. Additional Passages. IV. Generalized Use: 1. Word Field; 2. Qal Participle; 3. Breach with Yahweh; 4. God's Forgiveness; 5. Remaining Passages. V. 1. Qumran; 2. LXX.

I. The Concept of Sin in the Ancient Near East.

1. *Egypt.* The Egyptian concept of sin is associated with words such as *ỉsf.t*, "injustice, sin" (the opposite of *m'ȝ.t;* already the case in the Pyramid Texts), *btȝ*, "crime, sin" (since the Eighteenth Dynasty), and *ḫww*, "wicked act, sin" (since the Middle Kingdom).[1] Sin is that which violates Maat.[2] "I love Maat and hate sin [probably *ỉsf.t*]";[3] in the continuation "I knew that God abhors sin," sin is dependent on divine judgment. Thus we read in a coffin text that "I [the god] did not command them to do evil *(ỉisf.t);* it was their hearts that transgressed my word."[4] The so-called Ban stela reads similarly: "They did something without my having ordered them to do so."[5] Biographical texts often assert that the person has committed no sins. Although in Amenemope we read, "Do not say, I have no sins *(btȝ),*"[6] genuine confessions of sin are rare and come almost exclusively from workers on the Theban tombs (New Kingdom). It is noteworthy that sin is portrayed as a consequence of ignorance. "An

---

pāša'. E. Beaucamp, "Amos I–II: Le pésha' d'Israël et celui des nations," *Science et Esprit* 21 (Montreal/Tournai, 1969) 435-41; B. Janowski, *Sühne als Heilsgeschehen. WMANT* 55 (1982); A. Jepsen, *Untersuchungen zum Bundesbuch. BWANT* 41 (1927); R. Knierim, *Die Hauptbegriffe für Sünde im AT* (Gütersloh, 2 1967), esp. 113-84; idem, "פֶּשַׁע *peša'* crime," *TLOT*, II, 1033-37; K. Koch, "Die ganzheitliche Wirklichkeitserfassung des alttestamentlichen Sündenbegriffs," *Parola e Spirito. FS S. Cipriani*, 2 vols. (Brescia, 1982), I, 585-98; L. Köhler, "Zu Ex 22,8," *ZAW* 46 (1928) 213-18; L. Perlitt, *Bundestheologie im AT. WMANT* 36 (1969); S. Porubčan, *Sin in the OT* (Rome, 1963); G. Schmitt, *Der Landtag von Sichem. AzT* I/15 (1964); R. Youngblood, "A New Look at Three OT Roots for 'Sin,'" *Biblical and Near Eastern Studies. FS W. S. LaSor* (Grand Rapids, 1978), 201-5.

On I.1: H. Bonnet, "Sünde," *RÄR*, 759-61; S. Morenz, *Egyptian Religion* (Eng. trans. 1973).

On I.2: A. H. Edelkoort, *Het Zondebesef in de Babylonische Boetepsalmen* (Utrecht, 1918); J. Hehn, *Sünde und Erlösung nach biblischer und babylonischer Anschauung* (1903); J. Morgenstern, *The Doctrine of Sin in the Babylonian Religion* (1905); A. van Selms, *De babylonische Termini voor Zonde* (Wageningen, 1933); G. Widengren, *The Accadian and Hebrew Psalms of Lamentation as Religious Documents* (Uppsala, 1936).

1. In order: *WbÄS*, I, 129; I, 483-84; III, 247.
2. See already *Pyr.* 265.
3. Morenz, 130.
4. Morenz, 59-60.
5. *Urk.* III, 112; Morenz, 61.
6. *Urk.* XIX, 18.

ignorant man, a fool, does not know good from evil *(nfr byn)*. I did the deed of wickedness against the peak and she punished me."[7] Some form of suffering generally brings sinners' attention to their guilt.[8] Then, however, the deity forgives the penitent, saying, "if it is the nature of the servant to commit sin, it is the nature of the Lord to be gracious."[9]

The literature of the dead attests many asseverations of innocence, especially in the Book of the Dead, ch. 25. "I have not sinned against people . . . I know not evil and do nothing wicked," or "I come to you without sin and transgression, without evil and without a witness (against me)." This general asseveration is then followed by an enumeration of sins the person has not committed, i.e., by a list of acts viewed as "sins," e.g., "No sin is in my body, I do not knowingly tell a lie."[10] As the superscription to the Book of the Dead 125 shows, the purpose of these asseverations of innocence is to "separate" the deceased "from their sins," i.e., to remove sin by speaking the formula. Hence these texts, too, attest a consciousness of sin.

2. *Mesopotamia.* The Akkadian terms for sin can be classified in three groups.[11] First, an old taboo concept inheres in the three terms *ikkibu, anzillu,* and *asakku.*[12] One can not only *ikkiba akālu,* "eat what is forbidden," but also *ikkiba epēšu,* "do what is forbidden." Second, the words *annu/arnu, ḫīṭu/ḫiṭīṭu* (verb *ḫaṭû*), and *egû* (verb) are the most general terms for "a sin," "to sin."[13] In legal texts the first term can mean "punishment" *(arna emēdu,* "impose punishment"); in political contexts it refers to a breach of contract or an uprising. The term *ḫaṭû* is related to Heb. *ḥāṭā'* and probably meant originally "make a mistake," though like *arnu* it can also mean "punishment." It can be illustrated by a sentence such as *itâ ša iliḫa lū ētiq,* "I transgressed the boundaries of my god."[14] Finally, the term *egû* means "to be careless, negligent" (cf. Heb. *yg'*). This group generally seems to refer to cultic transgressions. Third, *gullulu* (or *gillatu*)[15] and *šêṭu* refer to the disregard of sacred duties, and do not appear in legal texts.

The characteristic enumeration of terms for "sin" in penitential psalms shows that in general these terms were synonymous.[16] Another characteristic feature is the surprisingly frequent reference to "sins about which I know and sins about which I do not know"; cultic sins were especially easy to commit out of ignorance. Although a person generally becomes aware of sins when the punishment comes, other witnesses attest a

---

7. *NERT,* 35.
8. See A. Erman's discussion of "penitential prayers" in *The Literature of the Ancient Egyptians* (Eng. trans. repr. 1971).
9. *NERT,* 34.
10. *Book of the Dead,* 18.
11. Van Selms, 78ff.
12. In order: *AHw,* I, 368-69, 56, 73.
13. In order: *AHw,* I, 53, 70; 337-38, 350; 191.
14. Van Selms, 37.
15. *AHw,* I, 288, 297-98.
16. Van Selms, 62; examples in *SAHG,* 270, 272-73; *NERT,* 108-9.

more general consciousness of sin: "Who is there who has not sinned against his god, who has constantly obeyed the commandments?"[17]

It is also worth noting that sin is often equated with acting *ina ramānišu,* "on one's own initiative"; i.e., sin is both arrogance and disdain for the deity[18] as well as a violation of the cosmic order set by the gods.

The "confessional mirror" in the *Šurpu* series specifies more closely what is meant by sin. In the second tablet most of the transgressions are of a social nature, in other sections largely cultic. Confessions of sin appear frequently, and petitioners ask for redemption *(paṭāru)* or for the annulment *(pasāsu/pussusu)* of the ban *(mamītu)* that is viewed as a consequence of sin but can also be explained as the work of demons.

3. *Ugarit.* Given the nature of the Ugaritic materials, it is only natural that sin is rarely mentioned. The term *pšʿ* occurs once,[19] parallel to *gʾn,* "arrogance." The occurrences of *ḥṭʾ* are in part fragmentary and disputed;[20] both cases seem to involve a transgression against a person[21] and for that reason do not contribute much to a more specific understanding of the term.

Ringgren

II. 1. *Comparisons, Distribution.* The term *pšʿ* is attested only once in Ugaritic, occurring as a noun meaning "transgression, sin."[22] While its use in Middle Hebrew and Jewish Aramaic derives from the Hebrew *(HAL),* Brockelmann *(LexSyr)* believes that the Syriac term developed independently with the meanings "to be startled, terrified; act foolishly" (contra *HAL*). In Hebrew itself the segholate noun occurs 93 times (plus Sir. 47:11), the verb 40 times in the qal (1 S. 13:3 only in the LXX; Isa. 64:4 cj.), and once in the niphal (Prov. 18:19; the LXX has a different text).

The distribution of occurrences does not reveal much. One notices that the verb does not occur in the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, and 1/2 Samuel. It seems to appear first in interim political periods (1 K. 12:19; 2 K. 1:1; 3:5,7; 8:20,22[bis]), i.e., in reference to events in the 10th-9th centuries. In postexilic texts, it seems to appear more in citations (e.g., Ezr. 10:13 after Am. 4:4; 2 Ch. 10:19; 21:8,10[bis]; Dnl. 8:23) than in original compositions. Although Knierim thinks it arose first in the 8th century,[23] this assertion cannot be proven. It was not part of the standard Dtn/Dtr vocabulary.

---

17. *NERT,* 108.
18. Widengren, 141-42.
19. *KTU* 1.17, VI, 43.
20. *KTU* 1.40, 11, 14-15; 2.72, 30.
21. M. Dietrich, O. Loretz, and J. Sanmartín, "Lexikalische und literarische Probleme in RS 1.2 = CTA 32 and RS 17.100 = CTA Appendice I," *UF* 7 (1975) 152-53; G. J. Brooke, "The Textual, Formal and Historical Significance of Ugaritic Letter RS 34.124 (= *KTU* 2.72)," *UF* 11 (1979) 78 with n. 78; a different view is taken by A. van Selms, "CTA 32: A Prophetic Liturgy," *UF* 3 (1971) 244.
22. See I.3 above; *UT,* no. 2128.
23. *TLOT,* II, 1033.

Although the noun is more widely distributed than the verb,[24] it does not occur, e.g., in Deuteronomy (and in Joshua only in 24:19), Judges, 2 Samuel, and 2 Kings; and although Knierim thinks its use is to be dated earlier than that of the verb, this assertion too is not certain. The noun does occur in sporadic late texts (e.g., Isa. 24:20; Dnl. 8:23; 9:24). It too was not part of the Dtn/Dtr vocabulary, even though it does occur in the corresponding context of Ex. 34:7; Nu. 14:18; Josh. 24:19; 1 K. 8:50 (cf. the context of Ex. 23:21).

2. *Theses (L. Köhler, R. Knierim).* Since *HAL* has adopted the essential features of Knierim's theses, they probably warrant our primary attention. Because Köhler's thesis ("protest, dispute, uprising, rebellion") still exerts some influence, however, it should be discussed on a case-by-case basis. Moreover, Knierim's interpretation of Prov. 10:12; 17:9; 19:11 is not really adequate. Furthermore, although the meaning "property offense" seems to be too narrow for Ex. 22:8(9), it is probably true that the noun must from the outset be viewed as an overriding term for several different offenses. Hence the following discussion will treat first those passages that confirm the basic meaning, then the doubtful passages, then those that add additional nuances, and finally those that become overly generalized. I believe we must leave in abeyance the question whether the noun or verb has priority. In any event the semantic spectrum emerges better when both are treated together rather than separately.

After an extensive discussion of an appropriate translation, Knierim suggested "crime" as an equivalent for the noun. Although this designation does indeed evoke the notion of a legal violation or breach, viewed from the perspective of our own legal system its primary association is with criminal law. Not only does Hebrew lack any word for punishment as a legal act, but its notion of justice itself is oriented much less toward punishments as such than toward the rule of justice and its concomitant peace and, in the case of breach, toward the reestablishment of that peace (K. Koch). Knierim's thesis does, however, suggest that *pš'* originally referred to a breach of this rule of justice with regard to a person or community (cf. *HAL*), i.e., to an offense to be regulated in principle by a trial (in international law: by war) if not explicitly by legal prosecution through forgiveness or similar procedures. Hence the following discussion will take as its point of departure the more neutral designation "offense"; it is worth noting, however, that most of the cases one is able to describe more precisely also generate a situation involving an indignation, agitation, or something similar, and so never permit any simple assessment, possibly because *peša'*, unlike either *'āwōn* or *ḥaṭṭā'ṯ*, refers only to the offense itself rather than simultaneously also to the sanction (though cf. Job 8:4; Ps. 39:9[8]; Isa. 24:20).[25]

III. Basic Meaning.

1. *Unequivocal Passages.* Gen. 31:36 is one of the passages confirming the basic meaning. Laban discovers his teraphim are missing and accuses Jacob of having stolen

---

24. Knierim, *Hauptbegriffe,* 113.
25. Ibid., 131-32.

them. The whole scene is an outrageous one, and it is not immediately clear how one would treat such a case in court. For his own part, Jacob is so sure of his position that he declares "anyone with whom you find your teraphim shall not live" (31:32).[26] Rachel avoids detection by tricking Laban, who thus finds nothing. Jacob then demands that Laban substantiate his serious accusation with a corpus delicti since he does not want to be continually burdened by the accusation, especially within the family circle; hence he counters with the question, "What is my offense *(peša')?* What is my sin *(ḥaṭṭā'ṯ)?*" Laban does not answer directly, but rather implements an extensive peace between the two men in a procedure described beginning with v. 44.[27]

Prov. 28:24 provides a counterpart to this story (one Jacob escapes): "Anyone who robs father or mother and says, 'That is no offense,' is partner to a thug *(mašḥîṯ).*" The situation is again an outrageous one, since the perpetrator exploits the fact that, as a son, he could easily take something within the family without actually committing robbery. What is especially base and infuriating is that he refuses to acknowledge robbery as an offense or legal violation. Prov. 28:21 probably also belongs in this context: "To respect the person is not good, since for a piece of bread a (free) person *yipša'* [NRSV 'may do wrong']." Is this case not also an outrageous one, since a free person certainly does not need to steal a piece of bread, and yet such confusing acts are indeed committed? The case is noteworthy only if the respected person can also be caught in the act of committing an offense.

The passages in Amos are especially vivid (Am. 1:3,6,9,11,13; 2:1,[4?],6). All these passages deal with particularly brutal offenses (except 2:4, which may be an addendum[28]), all of which are outrageous, including threshing with threshing sledges of iron, carrying entire communities off into exile to sell the inhabitants, violating the covenant of kinship, burning the bones of the dead, selling the needy for a pair of sandals, drinking wine bought with fines imposed on the oppressed of society, and father and son lying with the same girl. Yahweh's various sanctions show that such sanctions were difficult to stipulate because these offenses were also considered serious according to international standards (H. H. Schmid). Given this clear language, Am. 3:14 and 5:12, which do not describe the offenses more specifically, are probably also to be understood thus; even 4:4, which uses the verb twice absolutely, is probably to be read simply as "commit offenses."[29]

Gen. 50:17(bis) is a strong witness for this basic meaning. Joseph's brothers ask him to forgive (rather than pay them back for) their *peša'* after Israel's death. The text does not describe the offense, though in addition to kidnapping (Knierim), it could also have involved breach of the kinship covenant (see discussion of Amos above) and perhaps also forced implementation of the father's privilege of selling someone into slavery. It is no accident that the text does not describe the offense more specifically, since

---

26. H. Gunkel, *Genesis* (Eng. trans. 1997), 337.

27. H. Seebass, "LXX und MT in Gen 31,44-53," *BN* 34 (1986) 30ff.

28. A different view is taken by W. Rudolph, *Joel, Amos, Obadja, Jona. KAT* XIII/2 (1971), 137.

29. Cf. Knierim, *Hauptbegriffe*, 178; *HAL*, III, 981: "behave as a criminal."

even more than an actual trial, the brothers had to fear Joseph's other options for adducing laws governing aliens in proving a capital or similar offense against them (cf. Gen. 42). Their offense left open the possibility for many different sanctions. In any event Joseph granted his brothers' petition because God had chosen a different purpose with Joseph's rise to power: a global deliverance of human beings that transcends family quarrels with their various offenses.

1 S. 25:28 requires a separate discussion[30] especially since its context clearly differentiates between *'āwōn,* "guilt," and *peša',* "offense." Because tribute was not made to David's young men, Abigail falls down before David (vv. 23a,24a; amplified in v. 23b, "bowing to the ground" as if before a king) and accepts all the guilt *('āwōn)* upon herself. Because Nabal is actually the responsible party, however, and as lord of the house is also the person to represent it to outsiders, Abigail must explain her actions and does so in vv. 24b,25a.[31] As his name implies, Nabal was a fool and thus not really suitable as David's partner in such a situation *(nᵉbālâ 'immô);* Abigail thus acts in his stead (v. 27). That Abigail did not see David's people (v. 25b) constitutes not an excuse (so Veijola), but a mistake she immediately seeks to rectify (v. 27; v. 26 is doubtless an addendum[32] separating vv. 24b-25 from v. 27; v. 31a esp. is perhaps anticipating vv. 34-35, and v. 31b contains what is here an intrusive allusion to King Saul[33]). Nabal's disqualification (v. 25a) prepared the way for David to accept the gift of a woman (Abigail) as representative of Nabal's house (v. 27). The term *šiphâ* emphasizes Abigail's humility before David, while *'āmâ* in vv. 24b,28a associates her femininity with such humility.[34]

By accepting the gift, David forgives "the *peša'* of your handmaid" (v. 28a; v. 35 describes his acceptance). By acknowledging the omission of tribute as *peša'* (as a breach of peace with David), Abigail also acknowledges the justification for the threat David and his men represent for Nabal's household (vv. 12-13,34; vv. 21-22 are doubtless secondary). By accepting the *peša'* rather than the *'āwōn* at this point, she disqualifies yet anew the actual perpetrator of the offense and puts herself into a position to present her own petition with more hope of success (esp. since she now emerges as the enormously loyal wife of an utterly worthless husband). Because v. 28b picks up a completely different train of thought, one can conclude with v. 28a and leave in abeyance the disputed vv. 28b-31. In any event vv. 23a,24-25,27-28a are clearly required for an adequate portrayal of Abigail in this scene, and it is worth noting again that as an outrageous or foolish act, *peša'* leaves wide open the question of appropriate sanctions.

The use of the verb in 2 K. 8:20,22 doubtless refers to the international breach of Edom with Judah and is amplified by the expression (contextually applicable to Libnah as well) *mittaḥaṯ yaḏ yᵉhûḏâ.* Similarly, 2 K. 1:1; 3:5,7 refer not merely to Moab's up-

---

30. See the analysis of T. Veijola, *Die ewige Dynastie. AnAcScFen* B 193 (1975), 47-55, who considers it to be a Dtr piece.

31. Contra ibid., 48.

32. So also Nübel, "Davids Aufstieg in der Frühe der israelitischen Geschichtsschreibung" (diss., Bonn, 1959), 50ff.; Veijola, *Dynastie,* 49.

33. See H. J. Stoebe, *Das erste Buch Samuelis. KAT* VIII/1 (1973), 449.

34. I. Riesener, *Der Stamm* עבד *im AT. BZAW* 149 (1979), 83; contra Veijola, *Dynastie,* 48.

rising against Israel,[35] but to the breach, the establishment of independence (*pšʻ bᵉ*[36]). The same applies to 1 K. 12:19, where Israel establishes independence from the house of David.[37]

This context evokes a religious use of the term as well. Hos. 7:13 speaks with a similarly radical posture about Israel's breach with Yahweh: "Woe to them, for they have strayed from me! Destruction to them, for they have broken with me *(pšʻ bᵉ)*." Hosea's indignation at the breach emerges from the indefinite threat of destruction and violence, and is classically formulated in Isa. 1:2-3, which invokes heaven and earth to witness this scandalous breach with Yahweh *(hēm pāšᵉʻû ḇî):* "The ox knows its owner, and the donkey its master's crib; but Israel does not know, my people do not understand." The late text Isa. 57:4-5 calls the "Israelites" "children of *pešaʻ*" and goes on to enumerate a detailed litany of individual transgressions they have committed (idolatry among the oaks, cults under trees, child sacrifice, and so on), suggesting that the author was still familiar with the original meaning of the word. The Deutero-Isaianic parable in 50:1 ("for your offenses your mother was divorced") similarly presupposes an acquaintance with sentencing principles according to which considerable offenses on the part of the sons had to have been involved if divorce was at stake. Hence the contexts of Hos. 7:13 and Isa. 1:2 probably also include not only Jer. 2:29-30 ("you have all broken with me," par. "your own sword devoured your prophets"), but also Jer. 2:8 ("your shepherds broke with me," together with priests, keepers of the torah, and false prophets) and Isa. 43:27 ("your first ancestor sinned [*ḥāṭāʼ*], and your interpreters [? *mᵉlîṣêḵā*] broke with [*pšʻ bᵉ*] me").

2. *Ex. 22:8(9).* Regarding the text that is decisive for Köhler's understanding, Ex. 22:8(9), Knierim has demonstrated the following points.[38] (a) Because the OT always qualifies *pešaʻ* negatively, it cannot refer in a neutral fashion to "protest, dispute."[39] (b) V. 8b can refer only to the guilty judgment of the person accused, not to that of the plaintiff owner who suffered the loss, for OT law recognizes only the obligation of the accused to prove his innocence, not of the plaintiff to justify his accusation. Nor is a possibly unjustified accusation itself prosecuted in any special "case." Dt. 19:15ff., in an independent decision dealing with the false testimony of a *malicious* witness (17:12-13), provides for dealing with a divine judgment made through a priest. (c) Although v. 8a(9a) is linguistically difficult, one cannot assess it as substantively straightforward and clear[40] since neither *pešaʻ* nor the relative clause to *ʼᵃḇēḏâ* is inherently

35. See Köhler, 213: "rebellion" would be compatible.

36. So already K. H. Fahlgren, *Ṣᵉdāḳā, nahestehende und entgegengesetzte Begriffe im AT* (Uppsala, 1932), 19.

37. Knierim's explanation, *TLOT,* II, 1034, according to which the offense is property removal, is less persuasive since the Davidides hardly had property rights to the northern kingdom; perhaps "taking of specifically royal disposition."

38. *Hauptbegriffe,* 146-71.

39. Köhler, 218.

40. So Köhler, 215.

clear. The relative clause can be rendered both "this is it" and "this one [masc.] is it," and the general sense of *peša'* must be known before v. 8a(9a) can be understood.

Although Knierim succeeds in refuting Köhler's interpretation here, the unusually difficult wording prompts him to propose an extreme hypothesis. After the inner analysis of v. 8(9), he arrives at the following translation: "In any case of property offense involving ox, donkey, sheep, clothing, or any other loss, of which one party says, 'This was it,' the case of both parties shall come before God; the one whom God condemns shall pay double to the other." On the basis of an additional contextual analysis, Knierim now presents the hypothesis (a) that v. 7(8) intentionally does not pass judgment because (b) v. 8(9) now generalizes the situations in vv. 6,7(7,8) such that a divine judgment is to condemn or acquit the accused in any case involving something that is lost, whether through robbery, theft, embezzlement, or simple escape. Knierim's translation of *peša'* forces him to propose this hypothesis because otherwise he cannot explain why only v. 8(9) but not also the context dealing with "property offense" mentions the word "property offense." In particular, Knierim must deny that the procedure in v. 7(8) is comparable to the one in v. 10(11).[41]

This contextual analysis does not seem cogent. V. 7b(8b) varies the formula of self-imprecation in the case of a purification oath before God and could not be formulated differently because the case addressed in v. 7(8) was in effect only when the master of the house was not involved. The cases of both v. 7(8) and v. 10(11) were thus decided. By contrast, *'ᵃḇēḏâ* does not seems to be generalizing the cases of vv. 6,7(7,8) at all, but rather to be invoking a completely different and extremely outrageous case, one probably also addressed in Dt. 22:1-3 (which Knierim thinks is interpreting Ex. 22:8[9]) and more serious than the cases involving obligation in vv. 6,7(7,8). This case involves those who find lost property (an ox, donkey, sheep, clothing, etc.) and incorporate it into their own possessions. Based on the norm of 23:4-5 according to which a person was obligated to return even an enemy's escaped animal, this act was viewed as an extremely serious offense or violation *(peša')*. Dt. 22:1-3 explicates this case such that although those who find the property may well not know who the owner is, as soon as the owner appears as the claimant (or as the person searching for the lost property), finders are to return the property on their own initiative.

On this view Dt. 22:1-3 is inculcating a moral obligation without making it subject to legal prosecution, while Ex. 22:8(9) seems to address the legally prosecutable accusation of *peša'* with regard to a property claim (Knierim). The issue is not what the finder may or may not have known, but an accusation based on establishing the identity of a (possible) finder of lost property. The accusation was such that it could be decided only by divine judgment rather than by a purification oath, presupposing that the (potential) finder did not admit to having found anything lost. On this view it makes no difference whether one translates the relative clause with "that one [masc.], he," or "this is it," and *yō'mar* could even refer to the impersonal "one." It seems advisable,

---

41. So, e.g., M. Noth, *Exodus. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1962), 184-85; cf. Jepsen, who identifies v. 7(8) as being pre-Israelite and v. 10(11) as Israelite.

however, to translate "he is it," since prior to v. 8b(9b) the reference is supposed to have been to the accused.[42] Contra Knierim, however, the case of Gen. 31:30ff. is not comparable because it never even considers a divine judgment.

To the cases of vv. 6,7(7,8) the author thus added one in v. 8(9) presenting a moral rather than a strictly legal obligation, albeit an obligation outrageously easy to breach. That is, if the owner learned nothing about anyone having found the lost property, then the acquisition of that property for the finder was a success. Dt. 22:1-3 consciously tries to counter this situation by obligating the finder. If the owner learned anything about a potential perpetrator, he had to take recourse in divine judgment. It is in any event crucial for the spirit of such legal recourse that it was ultimately a matter of a decision from God.

Even if one considers the wording of v. 8a(9a) too cryptic to permit any final determination, it is clear that *peša'* here must translate as "offense" or something similar. Its appearance only here within the overall context seems to have been prompted by the indignation attaching to the case rather than by any fixation on property.[43]

3. *Additional Passages.* The previous considerations reveal that the noun means "offense, transgression," and is a general term for various offenses arousing outrage or indignation, and that the verb means "commit an offense." Several additional passages, while not specifically confirming this basic meaning, do, however, go along with it.

The admittedly older text 1 S. 24:12(11) falls into this category. According to v. 10(9), David had to defend himself against the charge of having sought to do Saul harm (Stoebe describes this passage as a coarse version of David's apology in 1 S. 26). Through an ingenious trick, David cuts off a corner of Saul's cloak in a cave, then later declares, "there is no wrong *(rā'â)* or transgression *(peša')* in my hands, I have not sinned *(ḥāṭā'ṯî)* against you." Although alongside *rā'â* and *ḥṭ'* the term *peša'* might also exhibit a weakened meaning, in the conflict between Saul and David the reference is probably always to a concrete offense. David did not take the opportunity to kill Saul (v. 12[11]), did not raise his hand against the anointed of Yahweh (v. 7[6]; cf. Ex. 22:27b[28b]), and did not commit any offense against the kingship in the larger sense or its representative (none of these reproaches was entirely unrealistic). Moreover, Knierim has plausibly shown that despite their age, Ps. 59:4(3); Prov. 28:24; Job 33:9; 34:6 all allow the reader to discern the form of the counterargument to the accusation of having committed *peša'*.[44] Mic. 6:7 illustrates the extreme of this situation in a line of argumentation pushing the idea of cultic sacrifices ad absurdum: "Shall I give my firstborn for my *peša'*, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?"[45] This author can hardly be thinking about anything other than an extreme, even extraordinary, offense. The book's liturgical conclusion provides the answer (7:18): "Who is a God like you,

---

42. Knierim, *Hauptbegriffe,* 160-63.
43. Contra Knierim, *HAL.*
44. Knierim, *Hauptbegriffe,* 123-24.
45. See H. W. Wolff, *Micah* (Eng. trans. 1990), 179.

pardoning iniquity and passing over the *peša'* of the remnant of your possession?" And without any sacrificial cult!

Mic. 3:8 is doubtless older; here it is probably the prophet himself who declares he is filled with the power, justice, and might to declare to Jacob his offense *(peša')* and to Israel his sin *(ḥaṭṭā'ṯ)*. Is Micah picking up here on Amos, is he referring to the breach with Yahweh, or is he intentionally leaving both open? Both Mic. 1:5 and 13b probably already come from the hand of a redactor[46] in that v. 5, e.g., is able to identify Jacob's *peša'* with Samaria (a concluding historical judgment). Hos. 8:1 earlier used the striking expression about how Israel "made itself independent of my law" (*pš' 'al;* par. "transgress [*'āḇar*] my *b^erîṯ*). In all these passages the tone of indignation and outrage is unmistakable. These offenses concern the very center, not the periphery.

In Isa. 59:12-14 the prophetic self-reproach responds to the general prophetic reproach with quite concrete deeds *(peša'/'āwōn; pāšôa'/kaḥēš;* oppression, apostasy, perversion of justice). Job 13:23 similarly seems to be envisioning concrete charges when Job challenges God to a trial with the petition, "Make me know my offenses *(peša')* and my sin *(ḥaṭṭā'ṯ)*." Otherwise the challenge would be meaningless since within the same context Job certainly does admit to less serious transgressions. The use of *peša'* is of considerable significance in the great sacral legal stipulations in Ezk. 18, which strikingly promise forgiveness to those who turn away from their transgressions (vv. 22,28; cf. 33:10ff.; 18:30-31, probably redactional). Ezk. 14:4 makes similarly concrete references applicable in this context.[47]

Isa. 59:20 must certainly also be mentioned in this context. "And he will come to Zion as redeemer *(gô'ēl)*, to those in Jacob who turn from *peša'*"; the only possible reference here is to the breach with Yahweh, whence the response in v. 21: "This is my *b^erîṯ* with them: . . . my words that I have put in your mouth shall not depart out of your mouth, or out of the mouths of your children . . . from now on and forever."

4. *Proverbs.* Several proverbs use *pš'* in a way incommensurate with the harshness generally attaching to the term. Knierim thus assumes that the meaning had been expanded into other life situations,[48] while *HAL* suggests that the term had weakened into a more general term for sin.[49] Because no specifically legal violation is described, the meaning attested in Syriac, "act unwisely," might fit best if Hebrew had an analogous expression. Or is the reference to a breach with the way wisdom suggests "one" ought to act?

Prov. 10:12 reads: "Hatred stirs up strife, but love covers all *peša'*." 17:9: "One who conceals *peša'* seeks love, but one who repeats a matter will alienate even a relative." 19:11: "Those with good sense are slow to anger, and it is their honor to overlook *peša'*." Knierim is incorrect in asserting that "here *peša'* is not necessarily a legally

46. Wolff, *Micah,* 179, suggests that they are Dtr.

47. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), 306-7, considers this passage to be genuine; see ibid., in loc., as well for a detailed discussion of Ezk. 18; 33:10ff.; 18:30-31.

48. *TLOT,* II, 1035.

49. See also *TLOT,* II, 1035, "in the sense of objectionable, immoral behavior."

punishable crime" in that the OT legal sensibility in no way entertains the notion that an arbitrary offense can be concealed merely through love or that honor can be established through overlooking it.[50]

Nor does 10:19 immediately evoke the image of a specifically legal offense: "When words are many, *pešaʿ* is not lacking, but the prudent are restrained in speech." If *pešaʿ* means legal offense or transgression in 29:16, we end up with a tautology: "When the wicked *(rᵉšāʿîm)* are numerous, *pešaʿ* increases, and the righteous *(ṣaddîqîm)* will look upon their downfall."[51] Cf. also 17:19: "One who loves *pešaʿ* loves strife; one who builds a high threshold invites broken bones." 12:13: "The evil are ensnared[52] by the *pešaʿ* of their lips, but the righteous escape from trouble." And must one not translate 28:2: "Through a land's unwise behavior *(pešaʿ)* it has many rulers; but with an intelligent ruler there is lasting justice *(kēn)*"? (The LXX reads: "The transgressions of the unscrupulous provoke a trial; but an intelligent man will extinguish them.") 29:22 provides a possible transition to legal contexts (e.g., 28:24): "One given to anger stirs up strife, and the hothead causes much *pešaʿ*" (cf. 29:6 text?).

Prov. 28:13 also suggests such a transition from "transgression" to "legal offense/breach": "No one who conceals *pešaʿ* will prosper, but one who confesses and forsakes them will obtain mercy" (cf. also Job 31:33). These examples generally do not, however, allude to legal violations as such. This meaning evokes "legal offense" in that sense only in that it is associated with outrage or indignation (cf. Prov. 17:19). Insofar as *HAL* accurately describes these offenses as "acts which break relationships within the community and with God,"[53] wisdom seems to be thinking more of those who act unwisely than of breaches requiring urgent legal redress.

5. *Additional Passages.* On this view, then, *pešaʿ* refers to an outrageous, imprudent act disruptive of the community on both a small and a large scale and one that could be viewed with enormous severity in connection with the legal sphere, international law, and especially in the relationship to Yahweh as the God who made his people into Israel.[54] The verb (including the niphal, Prov. 18:19 MT) is completely dominated by such severity (see below concerning the qal ptcp.), one possible exception being Prov. 28:21 (legal offense for a piece of bread). By contrast, the noun was able to maintain its character as a general term for various kinds of violations, which is why there are a number of generally later passages for which one cannot determine any precise sense, a situation considered in the following discussion.

Köhler's observation seems confirmed that the offense designated by the noun generally provoked something like indignation or outrage; if Knierim is correct,[55] the noun

---

50. *TLOT,* II, 1035.
51. No textual witnesses support the cj. *birdôṯ;* see O. Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos (Proverbia). BK* XVII (1984), 346-47.
52. LXX *nôqaš;* see *HAL,* III, 982.
53. *HAL,* III, 981.
54. That is, as a criterion; → ישׂראל *yiśrāʾēl,* VI, 412ff.
55. *Hauptbegriffe,* 131-32.

does not refer to both the offense and the sanction. This view can be tested on Isa. 24:20; Job 8:4; Ps. 39:9(8), which contain what might be called a threat generated by transgressions.

One typical feature of *peša'* seems to have been that its sanction was not simply fixed, but rather could involve unforeseeable consequences. Prov. 29:6 (put aside because of its text; non cj.) suggests this notion: "In the transgression of the evil there is a snare, but the righteous *(ṣaddîq)* sing and rejoice." The term "snare" expresses unpredictability, something corresponding at least to the wording of Job 8:4. When Job's sons sinned against God *(ḥāṭā')*, "he delivered *(šalaḥ)* them into the power *(b^{e}yad)* of their *peša'*." That is, rather than buffering the consequences of their transgressions, God delivered them to the power of the unpredictable results generated by their transgressions.

Ps. 39, a difficult text, especially gains cogency in this interpretation. V. 9(8) reads: "Deliver me from all my offenses *(p^{e}šā'ay)*, do not make me [LXX: you made me] the scorn of the fool *(nāḇāl)*." In a context shaped in a highly original and moving fashion by a lament on transitoriness and mortality, v. 9(8) comes as something of a surprise.[56] The pointing has raised doubts because the parallelism in the MT suggests a turning away of the wicked *pôš^e'ay*.[57] This pointing, however, is unpersuasive because the verb is otherwise never construed with an accusative (at most one might read *pôšēa'*, "deliver me from every transgressor"). If, however, one understands the noun such that the petitioner refers to his own transgressions, transgressions that might involve extreme sanctions, then the verse sequence does indeed make sense. That the petitioner goes silent in v. 10(9) doubtless means that he has no intention of taking Yahweh to court for his actions, as does Job. The formulation "snatch me away/out of" also acquires a bit of color in this interpretation. The customary conjecture to v. 14a(13a), "look away from me," which would fit one of Job's laments, also becomes impossible. Might one suggest an otherwise unattested niphal of *šw'*, i.e., *hiššāwa'*, "let yourself be prevailed upon by me"?

The remaining passage is Isa. 24:20. Its context, however, shows that this interpretive course is indeed the right one in that horrific consequences are associated with the burden of *peša'* on earth. Its foundations tremble (v. 18), it is utterly broken, torn asunder, violently shaken (v. 19), and sways like a hammock (v. 20a). The *peša'* mentioned here must represent an ultimate dimension of criminality and wickedness, and its effects or the sanctions it provokes exceed all boundaries.

Knierim is correct is concluding that "*peša'* does not mean 'sin.' For just as surely as the term has a theological dimension, the OT is in general interested in speaking of 'sin' in such a way as to call deeds and procedures by their proper names."[58] "The specific theological character of the term is determined by the basic meaning. . . . Whoever commits *peša'* does not merely rebel or protest against Yahweh but breaks with him,

56. See B. Duhm, *Die Psalmen. KHC* XIV (^{2}1922), 114ff.

57. H. Gunkel, *Die Psalmen. HKAT* II/2 (^{5}1968), 167; H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59* (Eng. trans. 1987), 416.

58. *TLOT*, II, 1036.

takes away what is his, robs, embezzles, misappropriates it. Although it always implies a conscious behavior, the term per se does not describe the attitude but the criminal act."[59]

IV. Generalized Use.

1. *Word Field.* The generalized use of this term is so varied that classification is difficult. A survey of the word field touching only on the most important features can function as an introduction.[60]

The notion of breaking with Yahweh (as in Isa. 1:2; Jer. 2:8,29; Hos. 7:13) also appears in 1 K. 8:50; Isa. 43:27; Jer. 3:13; 33:8; Ezk. 2:3; 18:31 (instead of MT *bām,* read with LXX *bî*); 20:38; Zeph. 3:11. Jer. 33:8 speaks plerophorically, "their guilt (*'āwōn*) through which they broke with me," as does Ezk. 18:31, "your offenses (*peša'*)"; Zeph. 3:11, "your wicked deeds (*'ᵃlîlôṯayiḵ*)." The sg. or pl. noun often parallels *'āwōn* and *ḥaṭṭā'ṯ* (*ḥᵃṭā'â,* Ps. 32:1; Job 8:4, probably not parallel; see above), e.g., *'āwōn* in 1 S. 25:28; Job 7:21; 31:33; 33:9; Ps. 65:4(3); 89:33(32); 107:17; Isa. 50:1; 53:5; Ezk. 18:30 (plus Lev. 16:21; see below), and *ḥaṭṭā'ṯ* in Gen. 31:36; 50:17; Josh. 24:19; Job 13:23; 14:17; 34:37; Ps. 25:7; 59:4(3); Isa. 58:1; 59:12; Ezk. 33:10,12; Am. 5:12; Mic. 1:5,13; 3:8; 6:7. All three terms appear together in Ps. 32:5; Ezk. 21:29 (plus *'ᵃlîlôṯ*); Dnl. 9:24; cf. the formula in Ex. 34:7 (cited in Nu. 14:18) and the similar one in Mic. 7:18; also the concentration in Ps. 51:3-7(1-5). The expression "they defile themselves with (*hiṭṭammē'*)" appears only in Ezekiel (14:11; 37:23; 39:24; cf. Lev. 16:16, *peša'* par. *ṭum'â*[61]). The expression "commit (*'āśâ*) *peša'*" appears only in Ezk. 18:22,28,[62] whereas one finds several references to concealing *peša'* (*kissâ,* Job 31:33; Ps. 32:5; Prov. 28:13), confessing it (*hôḏâ,* Ps. 32:5; Prov. 28:13 hophal; Lev. 16:21 hithpael, said of the high priest), uncovering it (*higgālôṯ,* Ezk. 21:29), or declaring it (*higgîḏ,* Job 36:9 par. *pō'al;* Mic. 3:8). The notion of forgiving *peša'* is frequently rendered with → נשׂא *nāśā'* (Gen. 50:17; Ex. 23:21 [not forgiving]; 34:7; Nu. 14:18; Josh. 24:19 [not forgiving]; 1 S. 25:28; Job 7:21 [not forgiving]; Ps. 32:1). Other expressions include → מחה *māḥâ* (Ps. 51:3[1]; Isa. 43:25; 44:22); *'āḇar 'al* (Prov. 19:11; Mic. 7:18), *'al/lō' zkr* (Ps. 25:7; Ezk. 18:22), → כפר *kipper* (Lev. 16:16; Ps. 65:4[3]), and occasionally סלח *sālaḥ* (1 K. 8:50) and *hirḥîq* (Ps. 103:12).

2. *Qal Participle.* The few occurrences of the qal participle constitute a separate group. The unequivocal verbal use (with *bᵉ*) in Isa. 66:24 shows that the participle can refer to apostates (from Yahweh). This meaning fits all occurrences (Ps. 37:38 [destruction]; 51:15[13] ["I will teach the *pōšᵉ'îm* your ways"]; Isa. 1:28 [par. *ḥaṭṭā'îm*]; 46:8; 48:8 [not criminal, but a renegade, and troublemaker from birth]; 53:12b [see below]; Ezk. 20:38 ["I will purge out the *pōšᵉ'îm* among you]"; Dnl. 8:23; Hos. 14:10[9]

59. Ibid.

60. *HAL* provides a detailed examination.

61. → טמא *ṭāmē',* V, 330ff.

62. See 2 below regarding the verb.

[stumbling]; so the enumeration in *HAL*). The only exception might be Isa. 53:12a: "because he poured out himself to death, and was numbered with the *pōšᵉʿîm*."[63] Isa. 53, however, is quite open to interpretation and was so already during the time of the LXX; so there is no need to assume a special meaning here, though given Prov. 28:21 such a meaning cannot be excluded entirely.

3. *Breach with Yahweh.* In its meaning "break with," *pšʿ bᵉ* has influenced several redactional texts with reference to Yahweh (1 K. 8:50; Jer. 3:13; 33:8; Ezk. 2:3 [not in LXX, probably a gloss]; Zeph. 3:11). The absolute use of the verb in Lam. 3:42 (paralleling "we have rebelled [*mārâ*]") in the sense of "act disloyally, renegade," probably also belongs in this context. Knierim also reads Ps. 19:14(13) as a reference to a breach with Yahweh: "Then I shall be blameless, and innocent of great transgression *(pešaʿ rāḇ)*" (cf. the context).

4. *God's Forgiveness.* Even if the sense is more indirect than direct, the relevant passages referring to God's forgiveness warrant examination. A sequence from God's lack of forgiveness (Ex. 23:21; Josh. 24:19) to his forgiveness cannot be discerned in Ex. 23:21 and Josh. 24:19,[64] particularly since the previous discussion has found that although forgiveness was certainly possible in individual situations, it was by no means certain.

Ex. 23:21b switches in midstream from a singular form of address to the plural, suggesting the presence of an addendum with an eye on Jgs. 2:1-5. The absence of forgiveness might thus refer to the failure to drive out the foreign peoples, something the context of Ex. 23:22-26 certainly did not envision (such is not addressed until vv. 28b,30b, and even then differently than in Jgs. 2; an identification of strata in this difficult text cannot be undertaken here). This constitutes a historical interpretation, not an absolute determination applying to every case (DtrN?).

The same applies to Josh. 24:19-22, which although without consequences within the context of Josh. 24 itself, is similarly interpreting history. V. 19 asserts that Israel cannot serve Yahweh because as a jealous God he will not forgive their transgressions, and v. 20 then explicates this assertion by explaining that Israel would defect to other gods. The people vehemently deny this prediction (v. 21), and Joshua takes them at their word (v. 22) by making them witnesses against themselves. That is, the people as a whole knew what they were doing when they chose Yahweh as their God and thus should not now be surprised at the destruction of their national existence.[65] This text is a kind of theodicy, probably exilic-postexilic rather than Dtn (contra Perlitt), explaining that the people had been warned from the earliest period, even while they were still tribes (v. 1). Neither of these texts contradicts Yahweh's willingness to forgive; rather both are merely interpreting a specific historical situation.

---

63. Knierim; *HAL* has a question mark here.
64. Contra Knierim, *TLOT*, II, 1035.
65. Perlitt, 260 n. 1; Schmitt, 12.

Even if Ex. 34:7 is difficult to date precisely,[66] it does say a great deal about God's forgiveness in explaining the name Yahweh. Yahweh is "merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and abounding in steadfast love and faithfulness, keeping steadfast love for thousands, forgiving *ʻāwōn, pešaʻ*, and *ḥaṭṭāʼâ*, yet by no means clearing the guilty, but visiting the *ʻāwōn* of the parents upon the children and the children's children to the third and the fourth generation." The proclamation is characterized by an internal tension underscoring Yahweh's freedom to punish guilt and yet to forgive, but not to forgive in any exploitable way even though his compassion and mercy abound. Mic. 7:18-20 use a similar proclamation as a liturgical conclusion to the book and introduce the notion that Yahweh is a God who does not cling to the anger once proclaimed by the prophet. Is Knierim correct in assigning this proclamation to the Feast of Booths?[67]

Enhancing the words of Deutero-Isaiah (55:6-8), Ps. 103:12 probably also refers to this proclamation in its assertion that Yahweh "removes our transgressions *(pᵉšāʻênû)*" as far as "the heavens are high above the earth" (cf. Mic. 7:19, the depths of the sea). Deutero-Isaiah chooses a unique form of expression in assuring the despondent returnees from the exile that Yahweh will indeed forgive them: "I, I am he who blots out your transgressions *(pᵉšāʻîm)* for my own sake, and I will not remember your sins *(ḥaṭṭāʼōṯ)*" (43:25; cf. 44:21-22). If vv. 22-24 function as an introduction, then the emphatic "I" means that even though Israel once burdened Yahweh with grievous guilt rather than calling on him and pleasing him with sacrifices, after the catastrophe Yahweh is nonetheless still prepared to "blot out" their transgressions (C. Westermann points out how important this assertion is for Deutero-Isaiah as a witness to prophetic continuity; cf. v. 27, which speaks of the breach with Yahweh[68]).

In 1 K. 8:50 it is Solomon who at the temple dedication speaks the prayer for such forgiveness after the catastrophe. When the people repent after the exile, "forgive *(sālaḥ)* your people who have sinned *(ḥāṭāʼ)* against you, and all their transgressions *(pᵉšāʻîm)* through which they broke with you *(pšʻ bᵉ)*." Ps. 65:3-4(2-3) uses an almost courtly or at least extremely formal style (date?) to proclaim Israel's own certainty to all creatures, i.e., globally: "To you who answer prayer! To you all flesh shall come. When deeds of iniquity *(ʻᵃwōnôṯ)* overwhelm me [better with LXX: us], you atone *(kipper)* them." The psalm ranks this particular beneficent act before all others that Yahweh performs. Ps. 89:33(32) also evokes a context transcending the individual in a (doubtless Dtr) Davidic lament,[69] recalling that Yahweh punished even the worst of the Davidic transgressions merely with the rod rather than breaking off with him entirely.

---

66. Noth, *Exodus*, 261, identifies it as an addendum to J; W. Beyerlin, *Origins and History of the Oldest Sinaitic Traditions* (Eng. trans. 1965), 26, associates it with J; J. Halbe, *Das Privilegrecht Jahwes* (Göttingen, 1975), 284, identifies it as Jehovist; cf. B. S. Childs, *Exodus. OTL* (1974), 610: Dtr; Perlitt, 213-14: Dtr; E. Zenger, *Das Buch Exodus. Geistliche Schriftlesung* 7 (Düsseldorf, 1978), 242ff.: postexilic.

67. *Hauptbegriffe*, 117ff.

68. C. Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1969), 131.

69. T. Veijola, *Verheissung in der Krise: Studien zur Literatur und Theologie der Exilszeit anhand des 89. Psalms. AnAcScFen* B 220 (1982), 118.

In an individual and yet prototypical fashion, the petitioner in Ps. 51:3(1) asks Yahweh to "blot out my transgressions according to your abundant mercy" (in 25:7 *pᵉšā'ay* in a similar context is probably an addendum). Because the superscription invokes one of David's grievous, capital sins, the psalm countenances an especially merciful and profound gesture of forgiveness. The thankful petitioner in 32:1-5 was probably thinking of something similar. He recounts how keeping *peša', ḥaṭṭā'ṯ,* and *'āwōn* silent burdened him, and how the simple decision to confess already eased that burden; he is now able to praise Yahweh's forgiveness with all his heart. The concentration of various expressions together with the lack of specifics made it possible to understand this passage as something the entire congregation might utter. A similar concentration of expressions appears in Job 7:20-21; the difference is that the person seeking to establish his own case before and against God can no longer hope to have his transgressions forgiven *(nāśā')* or his iniquity *('āwôn)* taken away *(he'ᵉḇîr),* for he did not believe himself guilty of the most important charges. A slightly different situation is found in Job 14:17: "my transgression would be sealed up in a bag." The reference is again to an offense that is not commensurate with Job's own circumstances.

In conclusion, Lev. 16:16,21 might be mentioned in this context. In an addendum to the expiation of the high priest and the people,[70] v. 16 says that with the blood of the previously mentioned young bull the high priest "shall make atonement *(kipper)* for the sanctuary, because of the uncleanness *(ṭum'ōṯ)* of the people of Israel and because of their transgressions *(pᵉšā'îm),* all their sins *(ḥaṭṭā'ōṯ).*" The multiplicity of terms serves to ensure completeness rather than precision, just as the ritual itself is not really comprehensible given its brevity. Is the author asserting that by entering the sanctuary as a representative of the people the high priest was surrounded by transgressions as if by a negative sphere, one he also had to divert from the sanctuary? Was the sanctuary, as God's dwelling place among human beings, to that extent also a human edifice in need of expiation? Or is the reference to an impersonal, material understanding of expiation? On the other hand, 16:21-22 concludes the scapegoat ritual.[71] Janowski has already shown that this goat was not a sacrifice or offering.[72] The high priest was to lay both hands on the head of the goat and "confess over it all the iniquities of the people of Israel, and all their transgressions, all their sins." The goat was then led into the wilderness, probably a symbolic act (cf. in Zech. 5:5ff. the woman sent to Babylon) intended not as atonement but as the removal from Israel's midst of all that was inimical to God. In the present context, this ritual is probably merely complementing the atonement activities; since Yahweh's own forgiveness and atonement were crucial for Israel's wellbeing, the Azazel ritual can only be secondary.[73] All elements inimical to God were to be assigned to the wilderness, i.e., to the world of death, while Israel was to be oriented toward life.

---

70. M. Noth, *Leviticus. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1965), 124; Janowski, 263 n. 419.
71. כִּפֶּר *kipper* → VII, 297-98.
72. Janowski, 208-15.
73. Janowski, 219-20.

Ps. 107:17 contains a textually corrupt reference to grateful petitioners who experienced affliction along the path of their offenses and yet were able to free themselves from it. The present context does allow at least that much meaning to come through.

5. *Remaining Passages.* The few remaining passages, like the ones just discussed, do not allow any determination of definite meaning. Such is the case in Lam. 1:5,14,22, which at the beginning of the larger lament recall Judah's own transgressions without identifying them more specifically. Ezk. 39:24 speaks similarly, and Ps. 5:11(10) remains vague as well: "Because of their many offenses cast them out." Ezk. 37:23 (from the school of Ezekiel?[74]) is a bit more concrete when alongside *gillûlîm,* "idols," and *šiqqûṣîm,* "detestable things," it also mentions the "transgressions" with which "Israel" defiled itself and from which Yahweh now wishes to cleanse it; the text does not, however, offer any specifics about these transgressions. In the Elihu discourses the reference to arrest or preventive detention (Job 36:8-9) is probably to be associated more with concrete offenses, though none is named, than with sins in the more general sense. The reference in Job 34:37 to adding *pešaʿ* to sin *(ḥaṭṭāʾṯ)* sounds like a fixed expression.

The remaining passages requiring a closer look are Isa. 53:5,8,12(bis), and Dnl. 8:12,13,23; 9:24. The grievous physical afflictions suffered by the servant (Isa. 53:5,8) suggest that the "we" are now confessing more concrete offenses for which they rather than the servant should have been punished. It is certainly possible, however, that from the perspective of the servant the "we" have gained a much more profound understanding of their own entanglement in guilt and transgression than merely of the kind of culpability resulting in that fate in the first place. Indeed, much suggests that the reference is to more than mere insight gained from ad hoc circumstances. In that sense the term preserves the character of that transgression while simultaneously referring to something more basic and profound. V. 12a (ptcp.), especially given the preceding trial situation, suggests that the servant was counted among the transgressors;[75] such an interpretation in v. 12b, however, would be too specific (MT: "he made intercession for the transgressors"). Although the LXX accommodates this interpretation by reading *pišʿām* in v. 12b instead of *pôšᵉʿîm,* careful comparison between the LXX and MT shows that these two texts represent two extremely old interpretations of an even older source text that probably can no longer be reconstructed, a text whose general sense was indeed probably clear and rich, but also intentionally ambiguous. For this reason conjectures from one recension to the other are rarely persuasive, and it is precisely v. 12 that the LXX and MT interpret differently (in v. 12a the LXX has *ánomoi,* "apostate," rather than "transgressor"). Interpretive specifics must come from an exegesis of Isa. 53 as a whole rather than from a terminological study alone.

Dnl. 8:12,13,23; 9:24 are burdened to an even greater extent by textual problems; the Greek translations all seem to be more an interpretation of an obscure text than a

74. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1983), 275.
75. So *HAL,* III, 981, after Knierim.

genuine translation. It is no accident that recent exegetes have preferred to keep most of the MT even though they disagree regarding its interpretation. If one follows their lead, it seems plausible to assign essentially the same meaning to *ṣāḇā'* in v. 12 (missing in LXX) as in v. 10.[76] In that case v. 12a would have to read: "and the host [of the heavenly representatives of the nations, later 'angels of the nations'] is given with the burnt sacrifice through the [religious] breach" (or with Lacocque, *b^e pretii:* "because of its transgression"). This interpretation is philologically satisfying even if one cannot persuasively demonstrate that the *ṣāḇā'* is identical with the heavenly representatives of the nations portrayed so vividly in Dnl. 10. The sense would then be that God did not allow any heavenly power to protect the "truth" (8:12b, probably the Yahweh religion, whose Scriptures Antiochus IV burned); rather, the wicked "small horn" was successful (v. 12b).

The question "for how long is this vision [valid]" in v. 13 similarly seems to be followed by an enumeration of its contents consisting more of catchphrases than of grammatically correct statements; hence "the burnt offering and the [religious] breach that makes desolate, and 'his/its' [read *tittô,* the breach's or Antiochus II's] giving over of the sanctuary and host to be trampled underfoot." On this view vv. 12 and 13 use *peša'* in its original meaning and as concretely as possible since according to 11:36-39 Antiochus bore the primary responsibility for the outrageous act of a religious breach.[77]

The MT in 8:23 reads: "At the end of their rule, when the transgressors have completed [their rule? deeds?]," a phrase directly evoking the circumstances in Jerusalem (Plöger). The LXX reading, however, may be preferable despite Plöger's objection, namely, *k^ehuṯam happ^ešā'îm,* "when the transgressions have reached their full measure" (so NRSV), even though both readings are possible. In 9:24 it is a matter of *K* or *Q;* the term *peša'* does not seem to have the same meaning parallel to *ḥaṭṭā'ṯ* and *'āwōn* as it does in 8:12,13, which probably refer to Ba'al-shamem and his cult (Koch).

V. 1. *Qumran.* Even though only the relatively secure passages should be mentioned within the Qumran writings, a brief outline of previous findings can provide a framework within which to view these examples. Kuhn (with supplements) lists 3 occurrences of the verb (including the ptcp. twice) and 42 for the noun. According to H.-J. Fabry (personal communication), one can now add 3 occurrences of the verb (the ptcp. twice, and an otherwise unknown hiphil form in 4Q184 1:15 [4Q *Wiles of the Wicked Woman*]), and 19 for the noun; the root does not appear at all in the Temple Scroll. Of these occurrences, however, only 4 are certain for the verb (including 3 of the ptcp.) and 49 for the noun. The recently attested hiphil form is ascribed to the seductress who causes the "humble" to turn away from God in sin (cf. also in 4Q184 1:4 the reference to the "multitude of sins in her skirts").

Among OT passages, Isa. 59:20(-21) exerted a strong influence in Qumran: "those

76. A. Lacocque, *Book of Daniel* (Eng. trans. 1979), 157-58, 161-64.

77. K. Koch, *Das Buch Daniel. EdF* 144 (1980), 136-40.

in Jacob who turn from *peša'*" (1QS 10:20; 1QH 2:9; 6:6; 14:24; CD 2:5; 20:17; 4Q512 70-71:2 [emend]). More familiar expressions include "wiping out sin" (*māḥâ,* 1QS 11:3), "forgiving" (*nāśā',* 1QH 16:16; cf. Ex. 34:7; CD 3:18), and "atoning" (*kipper,* 4QOrd 2:2; 3Q9 3:2). The uses of the participle are not surprising, including references to "a snare for the transgressors" (1QH 2:8), a "mocking song for . . ." (1QH 2:11); the extended context of 4Q491 (4QM[a]) frs. 8-10 I:15 recalls Isa. 66:24 with its intensive portrayal of the fire of Sheol (though the immediate context is lost).

Several Qumran texts develop the biblical tradition further. Ps. 155:12 (11QPs[a] 24:11) provides a skillful poetic development of Ps. 25:7 and its reference to the "sins of my youth, my transgressions." Are such youthful sins identical with the "first sins" (1QH 9:13; 17:18) for which the petitioner seeks consolation (1QH 9:13)? 4Q509 12, I–13:5 similarly refers to God as a consoler for those who have stumbled in sin. The use of *gillûl* as a new parallel to *peša'* in 1QH 4:19 (cf. *hiṯgôlēl* in CD 3:17) seems to have been influenced by Ezk. 37:23. The biblical notion of defilement (Ezekiel) is countered by God's purifying power (*ṭahēr;* "you have cleansed a perverse spirit of great *peša',*" 1QH 3:21 [from Ps. 19:14[13]?; 11:10; 4Q504 [4QDibHam[a]] frs. 1-2 VI:2), esp. "you cast all our sins away from us *(hišlîḵ)* and cleansed us" (cf. also 4Q512 VI:9).

One striking new combination over against the biblical materials is that with *peša'* and *'ašmâ,* "guilt" (1QS 1:23; 9:4; 3Q9 3:2; 4Q511 [4QShir[b]] fr. 18 II:9 [sinful guilt or vice versa]). 1Q4 35 is apparently new and noteworthy, but also typical: "Because of my sins I was abandoned by your *b[e]rîṯ.*" This context probably also includes 1QH fr. 4:14, "my heart melts like wax because of transgression and sin *(pš' wḥṭ'h)*"; cf. also 1QH fr. 1:4, "I am a man of sin" *('yš pš').*" The expression "mysteries *(rāzê)* of *peša'*" in 5:36 is both completely new and, given the obscure context, not entirely clear: "For (according to?) the mysteries of sin, they change the works of God by their transgressions" (also 1QH fr. 50:5; 27,1,1,2). One interesting new combination is *ta'[a]nîyôṯ peša',* probably "humiliations for sin" (4Q510 1:8). By contrast, I do not find the addition of *peša'* to *nṣl* (1QH 7:17 after Ps. 39:9[8]) and *nṣl* to *peša'* in 4Q512 frs. 29-32 VII:9 to be entirely certain.

2. *LXX.* In rendering the term *pš',* the LXX uses the entire spectrum of terms for sin. Terms it uses more than twice include *asebeín, aphistánai,* and *anomeín* for the verb, and *adikía/adíkēma, hamartía/hamártēma, anomía/anómēma, asébeia,* and *paráptoma* for the noun.

Seebass

פֵּשֶׁר *pešer;* פָּתַר *pāṯar;* פִּתְרוֹן/פִּתָּרוֹן *pittārôn/piṯrôn*

Contents: I. Etymology and Occurrences. II. OT: 1. Eccl. 8:1; 2. Joseph Narrative; 3. Daniel. 4. LXX. III. Qumran. IV. *Pešer* as a Hermeneutical Principle.

I. Etymology and Occurrences. As the distribution of occurrences shows (see below), this word arrived relatively late in the Hebrew language, whereas it appears far earlier in Aramaic.[1] Behind Aramaic itself one can then probably assume some connection with an early Semitic root *pṯr,* with /ṯ/ appearing in Akk. *pašāru* with its verbal adj. *pašru* and the nouns *pišru* and *pišertu.*[2] The G stem of this verb, a verb already attested in Old Babylonian witnesses, means "loosen up the earth, sell grain (?), settle an argument, liberate someone, prompt, report, explain, undo [an oath, a knot]." Thus very early the word is attested with the meaning "report, interpret": *pašāru šutta,* "interpret dreams,"[3] "interpret words."[4] A person could even have the profession of a *pāšir šunāti,* "an interpreter of dreams."[5] The noun *pišru,* "solution, interpretation," is clearly associated with the mantic and magical spheres, e.g., *iṣ pišri,* "magic wand," alongside

---

pešer. O. Betz, *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte. WUNT* 6 (1960); G. J. Brooke, "Qumran Pesher: Towards the Redefinition of a Genre," *RevQ* 10 (1979/81) 483-503; idem, *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in Its Jewish Context. JSOTSup* 29 (1985); W. H. Brownlee, *The Midrash Pesher of Habakkuk. SBLMS* 24 (1979), esp. 23ff.; F. F. Bruce, *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts* (Grand Rapids, 1959); J. Carmignac, "Notes sur les Pesharim," *RevQ* 3 (1961/62) 505-38; idem, "Le genre littéraire du 'Péshèr' dans la Pistis-Sophia," *RevQ* 4 (1963/64) 497-522; J. J. Collins, "Jewish Apocalyptic Against Its Hellenistic Near Eastern Environment," *BASOR* 220 (1975) 27-36; K. Elliger, *Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer. BHT* 15 (1953); H. Feltes, *Die Gattung des Habakukkommentars von Qumran (1QpHab): Eine Studie zum frühen jüdischen Midrasch. FzB* 58 (1986); A. Finkel, "The Pesher of Dreams and Scriptures," *RevQ* 4 (1963/64) 357-70; I. Fröhlich, "Le genre littéraire des Pesharim de Qumrân," *RevQ* 12 (1985/87) 383-98; M. Gertner, "Terms of Scriptural Interpretation: A Study in Hebrew Semantics," *BSOAS* 25 (1962) 1-27; M. P. Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books. CBQMS* 8 (1979); F. L. Horton, "Formulas of Introduction in the Qumran Literature," *RevQ* 7 (1969/71) 505-14; E. Jucci, "Il pesher, un ponte tra il passato e il futuro," *Henoch* 8 (1986) 321-37; W. R. Lane, "Pešer Style as a Reconstruction Tool in 4QpIs[b]," *RevQ* 2 (1959/60) 281-83; A. L. Oppenheim, *The Interpretation of Dreams in the Ancient Near East* (Philadelphia, 1956); I. Rabinowitz, "'PĒSHER/PITTĀRŌN': Its Biblical Meaning and Its Significance in the Qumran Literature," *RevQ* 8 (1972/75) 219-32; C. Roth, "The Subject Matter of Qumran Exegesis," *VT* 10 (1960) 51-68; L. H. Silberman, "Unriddling the Riddle: A Study in the Structure and Language of the Habakkuk Pesher (1QpHab)," *RevQ* 3 (1961/62) 323-64; A. Szörényi, "Das Buch Daniel, ein kanonisierter Pescher?" *Congress Volume, Geneva 1965. SVT* 15 (1966) 278-94.

1. *AP* 63.14.
2. *AHw,* II, 842.
3. Gilg. I, V, 25; VI, 192.
4. *BWL,* 134, l. 126.
5. *BWL,* 128, l. 54; cf. also Oppenheim, 217ff.

the magical solution and similar ideas. The reference is generally to an "interpretation" of dreams, earthquakes, and lunar omens.[6] Witnesses in extrabiblical Aramaic are apparently limited to *AP* 63.14, an extremely fragmentary text not allowing any significant conclusions. Cowley suspects the meaning is "to pay." By contrast, Biblical Aramaic attests numerous occurrences of both the verb and the noun (see below). Extrabiblical occurrences include also Syriac, where the meaning is "liquefy; interpret; solve [a riddle]," related perhaps by metathesis with *pᵉraš*, "to separate, loose."[7] In Christian Palestinian Aramaic the noun **pšwryn* means "explanation."[8] In Mandaic this semantic scope allowed a word to develop with a specialized, intensified meaning, *pišra*, "exorcism."[9] The word was understood similarly in Samaritan.[10] An etymological connection with the semantically similar Arab. *fasara*, "explain, interpret," *tafsîr*, "commentary (esp. one on the Koran),"[11] is possible only assuming the presence of a Proto-Semitic *š*. Given these findings, the biblical word *pāšar* is clearly an Aramaism.[12]

Horgan differentiates even further because she senses differences between Heb./Aram. *pšr* and Heb. *ptr* despite the apparent semantic overlapping. She suggests that the author of Gen. 40–41 adopted *pāṯar* directly from the Aramaic because of the excessive mantic connotations attaching to Akk. *pašāru*. By contrast, *pāšar* came into Hebrew by way of Aramaic, or even more likely into Aramaic by way of Hebrew. Indeed, the existence of double versions of the etymon does suggest the presence of two different paths. The semantic distinction Horgan suggests, however, is indiscernible; moreover, *ptr* is not attested in Aramaic, and Heb. *pāṯar* remains unexplained.

The distribution of occurrences is quite revealing. In the entire OT, Heb. *pešer* occurs but once (Eccl. 8:1). The Heb. verb *pāṯar* occurs 9 times and, like the 5 occurrences of *pittārôn*, exclusively in the Joseph narrative, more specifically in Gen. 40–41. The Aram. noun *pᵉšar* occurs 31 times in Daniel, 12 of those in Dnl. 2, and the Aramaic verb occurs twice (Dnl. 5:12,16). To these occurrences one can also add Sir. 38:14.

The main sphere of occurrences is clearly in the Qumran writings, where the term is attested more than 100 times, albeit, with a few exceptions (CD 4:14; 1Q30 1:6; Mur 18:6), only in commentaries to biblical books and in 1 Enoch. CD 4:14 is an exegesis of Isa. 24:19; 1Q30 1:6 apparently also focuses on the interpretation of biblical texts.[13] In Mur 18:6 the verb occurs in the ithpael in a debit note with the meaning "reimburse, pay back."[14]

---

6. See W. von Soden, "Lexikalisches Archiv," *ZA* 41 (1933) 220.
7. *LexSyr*, 607-8, 614.
8. F. Schulthess, *Lexicon Syropalaestinum* (1903), 165.
9. *MdD*, 372, 383.
10. See A. E. Cowley, *The Samaritan Liturgy* (1909), II, 67.
11. Wehr, 713.
12. See Wagner, 96.
13. See J. T. Milik, *DJD*, I, 132-33.
14. See Jastrow, 1249.

The verb *pāšar* occurs in rabbinic literature with the meaning "be lukewarm," probably a homophone, then "dissolve, solve, be loosed, undone," though also "interpret dreams" (e.g., Bab. *Yoma* 28b; *Ber.* 56a).[15] The word *pāṯar* is used with virtually the same meaning.[16] In the plethora of passages adduced and discussed in *WTM*, the meaning "interpret dreams" clearly predominates, while the meaning "interpret Scripture" is utterly lacking; among the rabbis the latter meaning was concentrated primarily in midrash. One can amplify *WTM*, however, by pointing out that *pāṯar* occurs in rabbinic writings with a similar meaning as in Qumran with the frequent difference that this "interpretation" focuses primarily on identifying and only secondarily on actualizing.[17]

II. OT. The previous discussion has shown that apart from Gen. 40–41, *pšr/ptr* occurs only in late OT texts, in Qumran, and in rabbinic literature, suggesting that at least the story of the interpretation of dreams in the Joseph narrative dates to a relatively late period (but see the following discussion). The contextual situation is surprisingly uniform in all these passages, since they all involve the interpretation of a problem presented by a king, and almost always the interpretation of one of the king's dreams.

1. *Eccl. 8:1.* Eccl. 8:1 only seemingly constitutes an exception to these findings. V. 1a ("Who is like the wise man [*ḥāḵām*], and who knows the interpretation of a word [*mî yôḏēa' pēšer dāḇār*]?") is an isolated saying, and in the present context functions as a rhetorical question to the discourse on the problem "whether inductive knowledge based on experience and observation is not perhaps different and even more promising than the traditional method of acquiring knowledge by learning proverbs."[18] Things may indeed proceed better with that method, but ultimately it too leads to nothing. Only in connection with v. 1b does the sentence enter its original context, where the wisdom and advice (and thus also the *pešer*) of the king's counselor illuminate the king's countenance.

2. *Joseph Narrative.* The Joseph narrative involves the interpretation of the dreams of the two high officials (Gen. 40) and of the pharaoh (Gen. 41). The dating and redactional classification of these texts depend on the classification of the Joseph narrative as a whole. Taken as a diaspora novella, it is probably exilic-postexilic, a situation then also commensurate with the late dating of the other occurrences of *pšr.* If by contrast one views the Joseph narrative as a continuation of the classic Pentateuch sources, then one will probably ascribe Gen. 40 primarily to J, and Gen. 41 primarily to E.[19] In any event the motif of the king who asks his wise men to interpret his dreams is doubtless an extremely old one, and such probably also applies to the impulse to have unpleasant dreams interpreted. This task was addressed by professional dream inter-

15. See *WTM*, IV, 151ff.
16. *WTM*, IV, 160; Horgan is a bit imprecise, 229-56.
17. See the material adduced in Gertner, 18.
18. N. Lohfink, *Kohelet. NEB* (1980), 56.
19. See J. Scharbert, *Genesis 12–50. NEB* (1990).

preters *(ḥartummîm)*,[20] who in Daniel are mentioned in connection with the magicians (Dnl. 1; 2 passim). The verbs *pāṯar* and *ngd* refer to the process itself of dream interpretation. The parallelism between these two verbs indicates that this process is a mediation of revelation[21] having nothing to do with divination, which is why diviners were not called upon in such instances. It exhibited more a prophetic quality, and because prophetic value was indeed ascribed to dreams, the display of such talent identified Joseph and, later, Daniel as prophets (cf. Gen. 41:38, E!).[22] Both the dream and its interpretation were thought to derive directly from God (see vv. 16,25,28,32). One significant feature is that in every instance the interpretation prompts and is immediately followed by some action.

3. *Daniel.* The symbolic dreams in Daniel exhibit unmistakable apocalyptic features. Here, as in the Joseph narrative, both the dream and its interpretation are understood as deriving from God (cf. the accompanying verbs *glh* and *yd'* haphel). This notion is now even intensified in that Daniel himself must query God by way of an *angelus interpres* concerning the "interpretation of the matter" (*pᵉšar millayyā'*, Dnl. 7:16) even though Daniel is otherwise quite able to interpret dreams (Zech. 6:14 Symmachus calls him *ḥōlēm;* Dnl. 5:12, *mᵉpaššar ḥelmîn,* "interpreter of dreams"). Here, as in the Joseph narrative, the dream interpretation initiated and effected by God is directed unequivocally against foreign divination. In the book of Daniel, however, the symbolic dreams and their interpretation do not prompt any action; rather they remain as the static solution to a riddle and the decoding of a dream. Nonetheless, here too the dream articulates a future reality, and the *pešer* itself anticipates that reality as viewed in the dream.

4. *LXX.* The LXX uses several different words to render these terms. For the verbs *pāṯar/pᵉšar* it uses *synkrínein* (the exception being Gen. 41:8, *apangéllein*), for the noun *pešer* it uses *lýsis,* and for *pᵉšar* the term *sýnkrisis* (the exception being Gen. 40:8, *diasáphēsis*). It translates Heb. *pᵉšārâ* in Sir. 38:14 (here in the meaning "diagnosis") as *anápausis,* "rest, recovery," interpreting the Hebrew text in anticipation of the reference to "healing" in v. 14b.

III. Qumran. Two components influenced the adoption of these terms into the Qumran-Essene writings, namely, the prophetic and the apocalyptic, both of which these writings develop with considerable rigor. First the prophetic books are interpreted (the task of the priest in the community; cf. 1QpHab 2:8-9), and then individual psalms (esp. Ps. 37), to which prophetic value is thus ascribed. Just as during Israel's period of exile, so also during this period of self-imposed exile did the question concerning earlier divine prophecy acquire urgency, and the *pešer* now rigorously inter-

20. → חרטם *harṭōm,* V, 176-79.
21. → נגד *ngd,* IX, 179-80.
22. → חלם *ḥālam (chālam),* IV, 421ff.

prets the biblical text in view of the immediate, apocalyptically understood contemporaneous situation of the interpreter and his community.[23] Nineteen different texts have surfaced in Qumran that undertake scriptural interpretation (generally of a single book; only 4QpIsa[c] and the thematic *pesharim* 11QMelch and 4QFlor cite from different books) introduced by interpretive formulas.

The following formulas can be identified, though no semantic distinction is discernible among various uses: *pešer haddāḇār ʿal* + subst., "the interpretation of the word concerns . . ." (e.g., 1QpHab 2:5; 10:9; 12:2,12; 4QFlor 1:14,19); *pešer haddāḇār ʾašer* + verb, "the interpretation of this word means that . . ." (e.g., 1QpHab 5:3; 4QpIsa[b] 1:2); *pišrô ʿal* + subst., "its interpretation concerns . . ." (e.g., 1QpHab 2:12; 3:4; 4:5,10; 5:9; 6:10; 4QpNah 1:6; 4QpPs37 1:2,6,8); *pišrô ʾašer*, "its interpretation is that . . ." (e.g., 1QpHab 4:1-2; 5:7; 7:7,15; 4QpHos[b] 2:12,15; 4QpPs37 2:3); *pišrô* + subst. or personal pronoun, "its interpretation: he/she/it . . ." (e.g., 1QpHab 12:7-10; 4QpNah 2:2); *pišrô lᵉ*, "its interpretation concerns . . ." (e.g., 4QpIsa[c] 6-7 II:8,17).

The apocalyptic element is clearly discernible in the formulas *pešer haddāḇār lᵉʾaḥarîṯ hayyāmîm*, "the intepretation of the word concerns the end of the days" (4QpIsa[b] 2:1, etc.), and *pešer happiṯgām lᵉʾaḥarîṯ hayyāmîm . . . lᵉ*, "the interpretation of the saying concerns the end of the days" (e.g., 4QpIsa[a] 5-6, 10).[24]

The almost exclusively formulaic use of the term in the Qumran texts shows that the term had acquired the status of a technical term for scriptural interpretation.

The *pešer* commentary of biblical passages appears in varying proximity to the original biblical text itself: (1) The interpretation orients itself closely to the sequence (of action) in the citation, sometimes even citing the text verbatim (cf. 1QpHab 2:10–3:13 citing Hab. 1:6ff.; 1QpHab 11:2-8 citing Hab. 2:15; cf. also 4QFlor 1:7-8, etc.). (2) Sometimes an interpretation will use key words or ideas as a point of departure for developing its own line of thinking independently of the text (cf. 1QpHab 1:16–2:10, which picks up from Hab. 1:5 only the motif "but you will not believe it when told"). Within the interpretation itself, such key words or phrases can then also develop a completely different identity through metathesis or associative interplay (cf. 4QpPs[a] 1-10 1:25–2:1). (3) Some interpretations are limited to a metaphorical identification (allegory) of the persons, places, or things mentioned in a given passage (cf. 4QpPs37 2:4, the Qumran community is identified with "those who wait for Yahweh [who] shall inherit the land" [Ps. 37:9]; cf. also 4QpPs37 3:4-5,9-10, etc.). (4) Occasionally the interpretation is only loosely associated with the specific passage (cf., e.g., 4QpNah 3:1-5).

IV. *Pešer* as a Hermeneutical Principle. In defining precisely the hermeneutical principle of the *pešer*, one encounters several different points of departure deriving largely from two camps. According to the first, the *pešer*, like the midrash, is part of rabbinic literature; according to the second, it is completely independent of that literature.

---

23. See J. Maier, "Zum Stand der Essenerforschung," *BiKi* 40 (1985) 52.
24. Further distinctions in Horgan.

1. The *pešer* was long identified with the midrash (Brownlee), which in its own turn is primarily an actualizing interpretation focusing on the author's contemporaneous situation, an edifying, verse-for-verse explanation or a punctiliar homily.
2. Although the interpretive method of the *pešer* is indeed similar to that of the midrash, it differs in one essential feature in that the interpretation itself no longer derives from the biblical text; instead, quite the reverse is the case in that it imposes an interpretation on the biblical text. The midrash is deductive, the *pešer* inductive. Because the interpreter draws from his own revelation, the *pešer* presents itself as an independent revelatory piece to a significantly greater degree than does the midrash; it understands itself as an explanatory revelation to an earlier revelation. The relationship with the hermeneutical method of the book of Daniel is unmistakable (Elliger, Szörényi).
3. Scholars have justifiably explicated further distinctions here (e.g., Silberman). The OT evidence, especially the book of Daniel, shows that in the OT the *pešer* is always associated with the interpretation of dreams and signs and never with textual interpretation. Similarly, a prophetic interpretation is also primarily the interpretation of a dream or vision rather than of Scripture.[25] Hence the Qumran-Essene *pešer* represents a mixed form insofar as it is a midrashic interpretation based on an explanatory revelation. Horgan takes this view a step further by suggesting the *pešer* emerged quite independently of rabbinic literature.
4. Rabinowitz adduces the etymology "anticipatory meaning, premonitory sign" (though cf. the earlier discussion), in rejecting an understanding of the *pešer* as a hermeneutical principle. He suggests that a *pešer* articulates a reality "presaged" by a biblical text, and identifies the persons, places, or times to which that "presaged reality" refers. The purpose of the *pešer* is to predict the future as shaped in the as yet unrealized presagement of the divine word, and to confirm the credibility of that as yet unfulfilled presagement by identifying the facts with the presaged reality that has in fact already been fulfilled. In his view the *pešer* thus has nothing to do with an intellectual understanding of a text; rather, it is the articulation of presaged reality and simultaneously the actualization of that presagement. "The term *pešer*, in fine, never denotes just an explanation or exposition, but always a presaged reality, either envisaged as emergent or else observed as already actualized."[26]
5. Following Szörényi's lead, J. J. Collins views the *pešer* as a literary genre associated with late OT apocalyptic. Contemporary circumstances and the lack of any charismatic prophecy to help in dealing with them constituted the foundation for the phenomenon of "prophecy by interpretation" articulated in the book of Daniel, in the Qumran-Essene *pešer*, and in the Demotic Chronicle.[27]
6. Finally, F. F. Bruce suggests that the groundwork for the hermeneutical principle

---

25. See Feltes, 196-99.

26. Rabinowitz, 225-26; for a critique see Horgan, 229-59.

27. See W. Spiegelberg, *Die sogenannte demotische Chronik des Pap. 215 der Bibliothèque Nationale zu Paris* (Leipzig, 1914).

of the *pešer* was already laid in the later prophets' reinterpretation of earlier prophetic texts (e.g., Isa. 29:12-13 → Hab 1:5-6), even though the Qumran authors interpreted it in a subjectively different fashion. They were focusing "not on yet another application of the prophetic word, but on its singular reference to the time and political-historical circumstances of the exiles on the Dead Sea."[28]

7. More recently, G. J. Brooke has pointed out that the *pᵉšārîm* are found primarily in books used in the liturgy, revealing thus their homiletic setting before an assembled community. On this view the authorized *pešer* is less the interpretation of Holy Scripture than the authorized interpretation of the community's own existence in the light of OT prophecy on the basis of a rigorous self-consciousness and consciousness of election.

Fabry — Dahmen

28. Feltes, 230.

פֵּשֶׁת *pēšeṯ*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology and Meaning; 2. Occurrences; 3. Semantic Field. II. Concrete Use and Meaning. III. Metaphorical Use and Meaning.

I. 1. *Etymology and Meaning.* The Heb. word *pēšeṯ* refers both to the flax plant itself and to the linen made from its stalks.[1] The term *pēšeṯ* occurs in the singular, though only with a suffix and only twice (Hos. 2:7,11[Eng. 5,9]). The term *pištâ* refers both to the plant and to the wick made of flax. Scholars do not agree whether *pēšeṯ* and *pištâ* represent two secondary forms or whether only *pištâ* occurs as a singular form of *pištîm.* If the latter is the case, then *pšty* in Hos. 2:7,11(5,9) should be pointed as *pištay.*[2] Tångberg

pēšeṯ. I. Löw, *Aramäische Pflanzennamen* (1881); idem, *Flora der Juden,* II (Vienna, 1924); H. N. Moldenke and A. L. Moldenke, *Plants of the Bible* (Waltham, 1952); H.-P. Müller, "Notizen zu althebräischen Inschriften I," *UF* 2 (1970) 229-42, esp. 230-31; A. E. Rüthy, *Die Pflanze und ihre Teile im biblisch-hebräischen Sprachgebrauch* (Bern, 1942); K. A. Tångberg, "A Note on *Pištî* in Hos II 7,11," *VT* 27 (1977) 222-24; M. Zohary, *Plants of the Bible* (Cambridge, 1982), 78.

1. *HAL,* III, 983.
2. So W. Rudolph, *Hosea. KAT* XIII/1 (1966), 63; and H. W. Wolff, *Hosea. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1974), 30.

disputes this hypothesis.[3] The word *pšt* in the Gezer Calendar may be adduced as a witness to the form *pēšeṯ*.[4] The same root occurs in Ugar. *pṯt*,[5] Middle Heb. *pištān*,[6] and Pun. *pšt*.[7]

2. *Occurrences*. The terms *pēšeṯ/pištîm* occur 16 times in the OT, including 4 times in Leviticus; once each in Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Isaiah, and Jeremiah; 4 times in Ezekiel; twice in Hosea; once in Proverbs; *pištâ* occurs 4 times, twice each in Exodus and Isaiah.

3. *Semantic Field*. Flax is often mentioned together with wool[8] (Lev. 13:47,48,52,59; Dt. 22:11; Prov. 31:13; Hos. 2:7,11[5,9]), since the two together represent the usual materials from which clothing was made. Sheep's wool *(gēz)* provides warm clothing (Job 31:20), while flax provides cool clothing (Ezk. 44:17-18). In Dt. 22:11 this incompatibility between the two materials prompted the prohibition against weaving wool and flax/linen together (cf. also Lev. 19:19).

II. Concrete Use and Meaning. Both Ex. 9:31 and Isa. 19:9-10 presuppose the cultivation of flax in Egypt. Ex. 9:31 mentions flax together with barley, attesting perhaps the use of flax seed as a foodstuff (cf. also the mention of flax in the Gezer Calendar; Müller). That linen was also produced emerges from Isa. 19:9-10, which condemns those Egyptians who work, card, and weave flax. According to Josh. 2:6, flax stalks *(pištê hā'ēṣ)* were laid out on the roofs in Jericho to dry, and 1 Ch. 4:21 mentions specific families of linen weavers. Hosea counts flax and wool among Yahweh's beneficent gifts, which also include bread and water, oil and drink (Hos. 2:7,11[5,9]). A capable housewife deals readily with wool and flax and likes to work with her hands (Prov. 31:13). The law on determining the presence of leprous disease presupposes that the affected clothing is made from linen or wool (Lev. 13:47ff.). According to Ezekiel, the Levitical priests were supposed to wear linen garments when serving in the sanctuary. They are not allowed to wear anything woolen, and instead must wear a linen turban and linen undergarments so that they do not sweat (Ezk. 44:17-18; sweat was probably considered unclean).

According to Jgs. 15:14, Samson tore the ropes on his arms as if they were flax that had caught fire. Flax was also used for wicks (Isa. 42:3; 43:17). Flax could apparently be made into cords as well (Ezk. 40:3).

III. Metaphorical Use and Meaning. The prophet Jeremiah performs a symbolic act foreshadowing disaster (Jer. 13:1ff.). Judah and Jerusalem will be like the linen

---

3. See also H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27* (Eng. trans. 1997), 231.
4. Müller, 230-31; and *KAI* 182.3.
5. *UT*, no. 2135; *WUS*, no. 2296.
6. Löw, *Aramäische Pflanzennamen*, 233.
7. *DNSI*, II, 947. See also Löw, *Flora*, II, 208ff.
8. → צמר *ṣemer*.

loincloth that has lain too long in the cleft of a rock and is now good for nothing. For just as Jeremiah girded his own body with the linen loincloth, so also did Yahweh bind Israel and Judah around himself that they might be his people; but they did not listen.

The term *pištâ* is used twice metaphorically to mean "wick." Isa. 42:3 describes the servant of God with the words, "and a dimly burning wick he will not quench," a negative statement reflecting the present situation. Although the exiled people are like a wick about to go out, the servant will not extinguish them, and will instead refill them that they might burn again. Isa. 43:17 describes Pharaoh's defeat at the Reed Sea as the extinguishing of a wick. The combination of drowning and being extinguished, of water and fire, recalls the chapter's beginning, where Yahweh promises to rescue his people, saying, "the rivers shall not overwhelm you . . . and the flame shall not consume you" (43:2). Yahweh is everywhere their savior.

This image of water and fire is quite different from the one in Isa. 1:29-31, which tells how the people will become like a garden without water, and the strong like tinder, their work like a spark; "they and their work shall burn together, with no one to quench them."

Nielsen

פִּתְאֹם *piṯʾōm*; פֶּתַע *peṯaʿ*

The term *piṯʾōm*, "suddenly," is an adverb with normal mimation, albeit with the unusual vowel *o* instead of *ā*. The comparable adv. *šilšôm*, "day before yesterday," is not really analogous, since it has probably been constructed from *šālîš* and *yôm* (cf. Old Bab. *šalšūmi*[1]). The *ō* in *piṯʾōm* can probably be explained best as the remnant of an original locative,[2] a hypothesis also supported by analogous constructions in Akkadian.[3] Less persuasive suggestions include derivation from an old nominative ending[4] and its explanation as the substitute lengthening for the weakened laryngeal.[5] The adv. *piṯʾōm* may derive from the noun *peṯaʿ*, "moment" (with a weakening of the *ʿayin* to *ʾaleph*). Double expressions circumscribing a sequentially intensified "very suddenly" seem to support this stem relationship: *bᵉpeṯaʿ piṯʾōm* (Nu. 6:9; Sir. 11:21), *lᵉpeṯaʿ piṯʾōm* (Isa. 29:5), *peṯaʿ piṯʾōm* (1QH 17:5), *piṯʾōm lᵉpeṯaʿ* (Isa. 30:13).

The term *piṯʾōm* occurs especially in the prophetic writings (10 times) and in wisdom literature (7 times). These occurrences do not include Prov. 7:22, where most exegetes fol-

---

piṯʾōm. D. Daube, *The Sudden in the Scriptures* (Leiden, 1964); L. Kopf, "Arabische Etymologien und Parallelen zum Bibelwörterbuch," *VT* 9 (1959) 247-87, esp. 271-72.

1. *ARM*, III, 74:5.
2. With C. Brockelmann, "Beiträge zur hebräischen und zur aramäischen Grammatik," *ZA* 14 (1899) 346; *VG*, I, 465; *BLe*, §65z; *HAL*, III, 983b.
3. *GaG*, §§113-14.
4. P. Dhorme, "La langue de Canaan," *RB* 11 (1914) 346.
5. JM, §102b.

low the LXX in reading *p*ᵉ*ṯāʾîm*, "(like) simpletons."[6] The word occurs only 4 times in narrative texts, once in a ritual text (Nu. 6:9), and twice in one psalm (Ps. 64:5,8[Eng. 4,7]).

The events qualified by *piṯʾōm* are almost exclusively of a disastrous nature, a characteristic Daube documents accurately but somewhat one-sidedly. Rarely does an author use *piṯʾōm* in direct reference to God's deliverance or salvific acts in the larger sense. To the extent that calamitous events described by *piṯʾōm* are directed toward the enemy, of course, they indirectly benefit Israel or an individual. Texts in which a person is the subject of the event illustrate such benefit. Josh. 10:9 and 11:7 describe surprise attacks that Joshua carries out and that lead to victory over his enemies.[7]

Both Nu. 6:9 and Job 9:23 deal, albeit in different ways, with the unexpected death of a person. Nu. 6:9 is concerned with a nazirite being defiled by the sudden death of someone nearby. In Job 9:23 Job reproaches God harshly for suddenly killing the innocent as well as the guilty and then mocking their despair.

Most texts use *piṯʾōm* to describe the suddenness of Yahweh's judgment. Nu. 12:4 uses it to describe how Yahweh suddenly speaks and cuts short Miriam and Aaron's uprising against Moses. The remaining texts in this context, all of which are in the prophetic writings, describe Yahweh's judgment on his own people. The accompanying metaphor in Isa. 30:13 refers to the wall with the break caused by iniquity. Statements in Jer. 4:20 and 6:26 announce and lament in an anticipatory fashion the desolation of the land. The Yahweh lament in Jer. 15:8 presupposes the events of 597. The text of Deutero-Isaiah in Isa. 48:3 refers to the prompt fulfillment of the predicted judgment. Mal. 3:1 announces the harbinger of the judging God.

Yahweh's crushing blow can also, of course, be directed toward Israel's enemies. The oracles against the nations in Jer. 51:8 and Isa. 47:11 describe the sudden collapse of Babylon. The "confessional" text Jer. 18:22 petitions Yahweh to intervene against Jeremiah's personal enemies, who as despisers of the prophetic word are also God's own adversaries. Ps. 64:5,8(4,7) reflect the successful answer to a similar petition in the form of complementary punishment; just as the petitioner's enemies suddenly shoot denunciations at him like arrows (v. 5[4]), so also will God suddenly shoot the arrow of punishment at them (v. 8[7]).

Themes associated with wisdom literature include the sudden end of the fool (Job 5:3), of the wicked (Prov. 3:25), and of those who devise evil (Prov. 6:15). Another theme is the admonition to keep one's distance and act prudently toward those of higher rank, who can quickly bring ruin upon a person (Prov. 24:22). In Job 22:10 Eliphaz asserts that Job's terrible circumstances ("snares are around you, and sudden terror overwhelms you") have resulted from his own sin. Ecclesiastes describes human helplessness in the face of the passing of time and of sudden calamity (Eccl. 9:12).

Two passages make direct references with *piṯʾōm* to God's salvific acts. Isa. 29:5 probably refers to the events of 701 in describing Yahweh's sudden intervention in a

---

6. O. Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos (Proverbia). BK* XVII (1984), 74, suggests a different meaning: "on the spur of the moment."

7. See A. Malamat, *EncJud Year Book 1975/76*, 178-79.

thunderstorm theophany scattering the enemies and rescuing Jerusalem. 2 Ch. 29:36 interprets the sudden success of Hezekiah's cultic measures as one of God's own deeds.

Sir. 5:7 warns against God's sudden day of judgment. Sir. 40:14, a textually somewhat difficult passage, probably refers to how hastily the wealth of the wicked disappears. Sir. 11:21 considers the possibility of a sudden turn in the fate of the poor when God suddenly makes them rich.

The three occurrences of *piṯ'ōm* in Qumran (1QH 8:18; 17:5; CD 14:2) are burdened by obscure or fragmentary contexts and for that reason offer little in the way of clarification. Moreover, in CD 14:2 the reading *p*ᵉ*ṯā'îm*, "fools," is preferable.

Thiel

פתה *pth;* פֶּתִי *peṯî;* פְּתַיּוּת *p*ᵉ*ṯayyûṯ*

Contents: I. General Considerations: 1. Occurrences; 2. Related Languages; 3. Ancient Translations; 4. Basic Meaning. II. Biblical Occurrences: 1. Substantive; 2. Verb: a. Qal and Niphal; b. Piel and Pual. III. *Pth* Piel with Yahweh as Subject: 1. Jer. 20:7; 2. Ezk. 14:9; 3. Hos. 2:16(14). IV. Qumran.

I. General Considerations.

1. *Occurrences.* Dictionaries generally translate the root *pty/h* as "gullible, inexperienced, (be) foolish," etc.[1] In the MT it occurs as a substantive construction and as a verb 47 times, and an additional 6 times in Sirach. No adjectival constructions are attested. Significantly, 18 of the 20 substantival occurrences (including Ps. 19:8[Eng. 7]; 119:130) and 14 of the 33 verbal occurrences, i.e., approximately three-fifths of all occurrences, are found in contexts associated unmistakably with the wisdom tradition. Most of the other occurrences, especially those of the verb, can easily be understood as applications of wisdom thinking to spheres not primarily associated with wisdom. Hence the semantic scope associated with *pty/h* was from the outset associated with the sphere of wisdom learning and conduct.

The only occurrence still unexplained is the personal name in Joel 1:1, *(yô'ēl ben-) p*ᵉ*ṯû'ēl;* it can be left in abeyance here.[2] In Gen. 9:27 the hiphil *yapt ('*ᵉ*lōhîm l*ᵉ*yepeṯ)* probably does not derive from Heb. *pth* (*pth* hiphil is not attested elsewhere, and *pth* is never construed with *l*ᵉ). This form may represent a unique and artificial wordplay

---

pth. J. Dupont, "Les 'simples' *(petâyim)* dans la Bible et à Qumrân," *Studi sull'Oriente e la Bibbia. FS G. Rinaldi* (Genoa, 1967), 329-36; R. Mosis, "Ez 14,1-11 — ein Ruf zur Umkehr," *BZ* 19 (1975) 161-94; M. Sæbø, "פתה *pth* to be gullible," *TLOT,* II, 1037-39; for further bibliog. → אויל *'*ᵉ*wîl;* → חכם *ḥkm;* → כסל *ksl;* → נָבָל *nāḇāl.*

1. See, e.g., Sæbø, *HAL.*

2. See H. W. Wolff, *Joel and Amos. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1977), 25; W. Rudolph, *Joel, Amos, Obadja, Jona. KAT* XIII/2 (1971), 36.

using the well-attested Aram. root *pty/'*, "be far, broad" (perhaps a late wordplay? Was the contemporary background for Japhet's dwelling in Shem's tents and his rule over Canaan [v. 27aβ,b] the advance of the Greeks during the later Persian period?).[3] The resultant Heb. hapax legomenon *pth* II is to be distinguished as an Aramaic loanword from *pth* I. Although some scholars also derive the ptcp. *pōṯeh* in Prov. 20:19 from Aram. *pty/'*,[4] a relationship with Heb. *pth* seems more likely.

The concrete noun *peṯî* (even in context only as a pausal form[5]) occurs 18 times (or 19; see below concerning Prov. 1:22; including Prov. 9:6 [see below] but not 7:22: here the emendation from *piṯ'ōm* to *pᵉṯā'îm* is unnecessary; the contextual singulars also militate against the pl. *pᵉṯā'îm*), including 11 times in the plural.[6]

The understanding of sg. *peṯî* in Prov. 1:22 is difficult: *'aḏ-māṯay pᵉṯāyim tᵉ'ēhᵃḇû peṯî*. Apparently *peṯî* functions here not as a concrete noun but as an abstract noun, though one should probably not separate the abstract use of *peṯî* as an independent word *peṯî* II (attested only in this particular passage) from the concrete noun,[7] since it is unlikely that alongside the unequivocal abstract construction *pᵉṯayyûṯ* in 9:13 an additional independent abstract noun from the same root would be present in what is probably the same literary stratum and yet not be recognizable as such based on its construction. König assumes that *peṯî* was from the outset an abstract noun,[8] albeit one that in virtually every passage was used metonymically as an *abstractum pro concreto* (synecdoche[9]). Considerations militating against this view are that the postulated basic abstract meaning of sg. *peṯî* is attested only in 1:22 and that the abstract construction *pᵉṯayyûṯ* is found in the same literary stratum in 9:13.

Because Prov. 1:22 is obviously using a wordplay, one should probably assume that within the extremely artificial or even affected context of 1:20-33 and influenced by the following half-verse 1:22aβ *(lēṣîm — lāṣôn)* the concrete noun has been used for the abstract.[10] In that case 1:22aα would be an additional occurrence of *peṯî* to be added to the 18 mentioned above. Zorell also understands the pl. *('izḇû) pᵉṯā'yim* in 9:6 as a *concretum pro abstracto,* even though → עזב *'zb* generally requires an object.[11] Such can, however, remain unspoken and be supplied from the context (e.g., Neh. 3:34[4:2]; Prov. 28:13; Ps. 10:14; Jer. 14:5). In that case *pᵉṯā'yim* here could, as in Prov. 1:22 and 8:5, be a vocative plural; or as a concrete noun it is the accusative object, "leave the simple ones."[12] It is unlikely that the same author would have used the

---

3. Wagner, 97, among others.
4. So, e.g., *HAL,* III, 985; *GesB,* 666.
5. See *BLe,* §72x'; JM, §96Aq.
6. Concerning the plural orthography, see *BLe,* §92p'; *GK,* §93x; JM, §96Aq.
7. As do, e.g., *GesB* and *HAL,* s.v.
8. König, s.v.
9. See E. König, *Stilistik, Rhetorik, Poetik* (1900), 65-69.
10. With *LexHebAram,* s.v.
11. Ibid., s.v.
12. So, e.g., F. Delitzsch, *Proverbs of Solomon. KD,* 2 vols. (Eng. trans. repr. 1970), I, 200; cf. O. Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos (Proverbia). BK* XVII (1984), 99. The ancient versions and most comms. translate differently.

abstract *p^eṯayyûṯ* in 9:13 but a different, ambiguous abstract *p^eṯā'yim* in 9:6 (Delitzsch). The emendation from *p^eṯā'yim* to *p^eṯayyûṯ* is then unnecessary. Nor could one explain how an original *p^eṯayyûṯ* could have been misread as *p^eṯā'yim.*

Apart from the concrete noun *peṯî,* the abstract noun *p^eṯayyûṯ* is also attested once (Prov. 9:13), a late and probably artificial construction (like the parallel hapax legomenon *k^esîlûṯ;* Aramaic influence?[13]) that was never incorporated into the more commonly used biblical and postbiblical language.

The verb *pth* occurs in the qal, niphal, pual, and frequently in the piel. The qal occurs only 5 times in the MT and 4 times in Sirach. Significantly, 7 of the 9 occurrences are participial, *pōṯeh* (with Prov. 20:19; see above), the substantive form that thus refers to a characteristic or condition rather than to a process or act. The two occurrences of qal finite forms (Dt. 11:16; Job 31:27) probably also represent verbs indicating condition rather than events or actions.[14] The two occurrences of *pth* niphal (Job 31:9; Jer. 20:7) are probably best construed as *niphal tolerativum* focused on the actual resulting effect rather than on the process.[15] In all 4 occurrences (with Sir. 42:10, here hithpael as a textual variant in ms. B mg.), the pual similarly focuses on the resulting condition of one who is gullible or foolish, the condition that becomes the foundation and possibility for resulting events.

By far the most frequent form is the piel (18 occurrences). Given the intransitive meaning of the basic stem, the piel exhibits factitive meaning; i.e., "it refers to the establishment of the adjectival condition without regard for the sequence of events."[16] The factitive meaning of the piel includes the declarative-estimative as well.[17]

2. *Related Languages.* The root *pty/h* is not found in Akkadian. Similarly, the single occurrence of Ugar. *pt* can at most be related with Aram. *pty/',* "be far," or even more likely with *ptt,* "break, break into small pieces," but not with Heb. *pty/h.*[18] By contrast, Aram. *pty/',* "breadth, distance," "be far, distant," is well attested;[19] cf. also Akk. *pūtu.*[20] Many scholars assume that Heb. *pty/h* shares the same root with Aram. *pty/'.*[21] Hebrew would then be using the basic meaning "be far, distant" only metonymically in the sense of "(intellectually) distant," "impressionable," "able to be tempted." Since Heb. *pty/h* nowhere allows the assumed basic meaning to be discerned,[22] however, it is best to assume the presence of two different roots[23] and not to adduce Aram. *pty/'* in determining the basic meaning of Heb. *pty/h.*

---

13. See Wagner, 130-31; cf. also *GK,* §86k.
14. So Sæbø; *HP,* 21; a different view is taken by, e.g., *HAL,* III, 984.
15. JM, §51c; *GK,* §51c.
16. *HP,* 275; on Jer. 20:7; Ezk. 14:9; Hos. 2:16(14), see III below.
17. *HP,* 43.
18. *WUS,* no. 2289; a different view is taken by *UT,* no. 2129.
19. See *DNSI,* II, 951; Beyer, 673; *LexLingAram,* 141; *KBL*², 1115.
20. *AHw,* II, 884-85.
21. See *WTM* and Jastrow, s.v. *p^eṯā'* and *pāṯâ; LexHebAram;* both König and *GesTh,* s.v. *pth.*
22. Concerning *yapt* in Gen. 9:27, see I.1 above.
23. As do, e.g., *KBL*², *HAL,* and *GesB* s.v. *pth* I and II.

By contrast, some relationship may indeed obtain between Heb. *pty/h* and Arab. *fatā(w),* "be youthful," "be generous,"[24] *fatan,* "youth, young person," and Aram. *paṯyā',* "child," "inexperienced child, lad," "noble person, someone receptive to the good,"[25] since these terms all exhibit a similar semantic field.

3. *Ancient Translations.* Strikingly, the Vulg. (and Jerome's Psalms) translate the subst. *peṯî* in the majority of instances with *parvulus* (13 times), *infantia* (twice), and *innocens* (once), i.e., expressions that are not inherently negative and that emphasize especially the idea of inexperienced youth in *peṯî* (only a few passages use *stultus, deceptus,* etc.). As a rule, the Vulg. renders the verb *pth* with general expressions for deception, including *decipere* (12 times), *lactare* (6 times), but only 4 times with *seducere,* "tempt, seduce" (Ex. 22:15[16]; Jer. 20:7[bis]; Hos. 7:11).

In over half the occurrences, the LXX translates the subst. *peṯî* with *áphrōn,* "ignorant" (10 times), yet almost equally as often with designations expressing youthfulness or good-naturedness (*nḗpios* 4 times, *ákakos* 5 times). In Prov. 1:22 the LXX even views the *p*ᵉ*ṯāyim* as those who are in special need or are worthy of protection, and alters accordingly. So in approximately half the occurrences, the LXX understands *peṯî* in an unmistakably positive sense. It renders the verb *pth* generally as *apatán,* "deceive, cheat" (16 times), less frequently as *planán,* "lead astray" (5 times). It is also worth noting that the LXX never translates the verb with expressions normally associated with sexual-erotic seduction (e.g., *thélgein,* "enchant, seduce, tempt"; but cf. Aquila).

4. *Basic Meaning.* Although the subst. *peṯî* refers exclusively to persons, it never refers to actual, concrete individuals, but rather always in a more general sense to a group of persons with their specific and typical individuality. The same qualification also seems to apply to the plural occurrences (over half of all occurrences), though sg. *peṯî* also always focuses on the general category of the "simple" or "fools" as such. The subst. *peṯî* is never used as an attribute. It occurs as a predicate nominative only with pronominal subjects and with the further qualification that the entire clause itself functions as a subject clause (*mî peṯî,* "whoever is a simpleton, . . ." Prov. 9:4,16). Everywhere else, *peṯî* itself functions as the subject either grammatically or in principle (e.g., as a vocative, 1:22; 8:5; 9:6?); i.e., the quality referred to by *peṯî* is not viewed as an accidental or ad hoc characteristic, but as a trait characterizing a specific group of persons in their real and essential individuality. Accordingly, the verbal use of the root in the transitive and active piel always takes a person as the direct object, while the passive pual and niphal and the conditional-descriptive qal always take a personal subject. Just as with the subst. *peṯî,* so also with the verb, the bearer of the *peṯî* condition is never an object or thing, but rather always a person or group of persons (mediated in one instance by an animal metaphor, Hos. 7:11).

---

24. Wehr, 696.
25. *ANH,* 1356; Jastrow, 1253; *WTM,* IV, 157.

Clauses with the verb *pth* often follow explicative and consecutive clausal constructions (e.g., Dt. 11:16; Jgs. 14:15; 16:5; 1 K. 22:20; Prov. 16:29; Jer. 20:10; Ezk. 14:9a). Yet even when syntactically no consecutive construction is present, a result of *pth* is generally given in substance (e.g., in Jer. 20:7, v. 7b explicates v. 7a by citing the result of *pth* and of → חזק *ḥzq*), or an explicative result is at least envisioned without being actually mentioned (e.g., Prov. 1:10, "my child, if sinners entice you," namely, to be and act like them; cf. vv. 11ff.). When the subst. *peṯî* refers to the bearer of an action and event, it is always intended reduplicatively such that the action in question appears as a result of the condition designated by *peṯî*. To the extent and because they are simple and foolish, the simple as such behave in a certain way or suffer certain events (cf., e.g., Prov. 14:15, "the simple believe everything"). Hence both the verbal and the substantival use of the root *pty/h* always focus on simpleness and foolishness as the basis and foundation for some subsequent action or occurrence.

Whereas, e.g., both *kᵉsîl*, "fool" (→ כסל *ksl*), and → נָבָל *nāḇāl*, "foolish, disdainful," are always negatively colored and imply a negative moral, theological, and religious assessment, *pty/h* is never used negatively in and of itself. It is a *vox media* that never implies a value judgment by itself.[26] At the same time, however, the condition described by *pty/h* is never itself a desirable goal or one in which a person should abide; so even though no moral or religious value judgment inheres in *pty/h* itself, it does nonetheless always imply a lack or shortcoming. This lack can be circumstances that must and can be overcome. The situation characterized by this lack is then viewed as especially endangered and in special need of protection; here *pty/h* is associated more with the notion of inexperienced, naive youth (cf., e.g., Prov. 1:4; 7:7, par. → נער *na'ar*). Here *pty/h* is used *in partem positivam*. Or the person is viewed as one who persists in this condition and who allows his or her behavior to be determined by this condition. Here *pty/h* is used *in partem negativam*. What in and of itself is a description of a condition involving no value judgment acquires a positive or negative component from the accompanying context.

Hence *pty/h* refers to a certain type of person lacking the necessary maturity and understanding; such persons are accordingly often portrayed as being young. At the same time, however, they are both in need of and open to instruction and education. This lack results in a certain incapacity for dealing with life situations in a way protecting the person from harm; in that sense it also means danger, often described as quite extreme. This endangerment results in the need for special protection, and the person is characterized by a certain helplessness; this situation generates the idea that such persons are in special need of Yahweh's protection and thus also of his special attention.

II. Biblical Occurrences.

1. *Substantive*. In Prov. 1:20-33 personified Wisdom addresses those who still lack knowledge and understanding. She addresses her listeners as the "simple and inexperienced" and considers the possibility that they will not heed her advice; for they appar-

---

26. Delitzsch, *Proverbs*, I, 56.

ently cling to their "simpleness" and even "love" it (v. 22).[27] She laments the "turning away of the simple"[28] from wisdom and how they persist in their "simpleness." Ultimately, however, this "turning away" will kill them (v. 32)[29] by causing their lives to end in failure. Within the discourse as a whole, however, this portrayal of ignorance and its consequences functions not to scold the "simple," but to warn them and to serve as a deterrent in prompting them to heed Wisdom's advice. The purpose is thus solicitous admonition.

Prov. 8:1-21 contains yet another of Wisdom's great admonitory discourses. Here too Wisdom addresses the "simple and inexperienced" that they might acquire prudence and intelligence from her (v. 5). If they will but accept the instruction of Wisdom, they will be endowed with wealth and abundant treasures, i.e., have a successful, fulfilled life (v. 21).

Prov. 9:1-6,13-18 conclude the larger collection of Prov. 1–9 and at the same time provide the transition to the following collection in Prov. 10ff.[30] Here Wisdom appears as a hostess who sends out her servant girls with invitations to a great feast in her new house (vv. 1-6). Once again, the invited guests are the "simple and inexperienced" (v. 4). If they accept Wisdom's invitation, they acquire life (v. 6). By contrast, Foolishness merely mimics Wisdom (vv. 13-18); she too invites the "simple and inexperienced" into her house (v. 16). She is herself, however, completely characterized by *pᵉṯayyûṯ* and *kᵉsîlûṯ*, by "foolishness" and "ignorance." Hence anyone who enters her house will remain a *peṯî*, "simple and inexperienced," and will enter the sphere of death (v. 18) as the result of a failed life.

According to the extensive superscription to the book of Proverbs as a whole in 1:1-6, these "proverbs of Solomon" were composed to teach shrewdness and knowledge to the "simple and inexperienced," i.e., to the uneducated young who are still open to instruction (v. 4), that they might lead successful lives.

The four pericopes just discussed circumscribe both the knowledge offered by Wisdom and the condition of the addressees with a plethora of semantically related expressions. Alongside → חכם *ḥkm, ḥoḵmâ,* "wisdom," these texts also use words from the roots → ידע *yd',* → בין *byn,* → יכח *ykḥ,* → יעץ *y'ṣ,* → ערם *'rm,* → זמם *zmm,* → ישר *yšr,* and finally also the expression *yir'aṯ yhwh* using the root → ירא *yr'*. Alongside *peṯî* itself, the texts also use → ליץ *lyṣ,* → כסל *ksl,* and *ḥᵃsar lēḇ* from → חסר *ḥsr.* This concentration of semantically related expressions probably does not distinguish in any terminologically rigid fashion among the individual terms.[31] At the same time, the word *peṯî* clearly expresses a lack of experience and maturity and the attendant incapacity and helplessness on the one hand together with an openness to be instructed and guided by Wisdom on the other. Wisdom is to put the *pᵉṯā'îm,* those not yet able to master life themselves, into a position to do just that, namely, to avoid harm and to pursue successful lives. In the two

27. → אהב *'hb,* I, 99ff.
28. → שוב *šwb.*
29. → הרג *hārag (hāragh),* III, 447ff.
30. See B. Gemser, *Sprüche Salomos. HAT* I/16 ([2]1963), 51.
31. See G. von Rad, *Wisdom in Israel* (Eng. trans. 1972), 53ff.

torah psalms, Ps. 19B and Ps. 119, it is the torah itself, Yahweh's own guidance, that assumes this task. Yahweh's "words" give light by imparting understanding to "the simple and inexperienced" (*byn* hiphil, 119:130). Yahweh's guidance, his "witness," is "sure," and makes the "simple and inexperienced" wise (*ḥkm* hiphil, 19:8[7]).

The "simple and inexperienced," however, although basically open to guidance and capable of being brought out of that "simpleness," can at times also cling stubbornly to it and allow it to determine their behavior. Both possibilities are considered and articulated in the aphorisms within the partial collection Prov. 10:1–22:16 (with 27:12 as a doublet of 22:3; the subst. *peṯî* does not occur in the remaining collections of the book of Proverbs). Even the "simple and inexperienced" can learn something if they see a scoffer *(lēṣ)* struck; similarly, they can also acquire knowledge if they see a person reproved who is already considered to be intelligent (19:25). When a scoffer *(lēṣ)* is punished, the "simple and inexperienced" become wiser, just as they similarly increase in knowledge when those who are already considered wise are themselves instructed (21:11; in both passages *peṯî* is probably also the subject in each of the immediately following half-verses[32]).

In contrast to the "clever," who consider every step, the "simple and inexperienced" believe every word without hesitation (Prov. 14:15). In fact, the "inheritance"[33] of the "simple and inexperienced" is to act and speak impulsively and foolishly (*'iwweleṯ*, 14:18). Whereas "the clever see danger and hide" (*str* niphal; cf. *BHS*), the "simple and inexperienced" go on, and suffer for it (22:3 = 27:12).

As part of a general admonitory wisdom discourse, Prov. 7:6-23 represents a kind of experiential account of how a loose woman seduces a young man.[34] He who falls for her wiles is among the "simple and inexperienced" *(bappeṯā'yim),* the "youths" *(babbānîm);* he is a "young man without sense" (*na'ar ḥasar lēḇ*, v. 7). The two terms *peṯā'yim* and *bānîm* parallel one another here, and the person actually observed from this group is said to be *ḥasar lēḇ*. Although the term *peṯî* is indeed used here in connection with sexual and erotic seduction, it is not itself part of the vocabulary of eroticism. Here as elsewhere it refers more to the young man who from lack of experience and understanding is not up to the situation and as a result is harmed by it.[35]

In Ezk. 45:20 *peṯî* follows and explicates *'îš šōḡeh*, "one who has sinned through error,"[36] referring almost apologetically to someone who because of ignorance was unable to avoid committing a transgression in the sanctuary. Ps. 116:6 focuses exclusively on the element of helplessness in the *peṯî* and on the resultant need for protection. The petitioner identifies himself as one of the *peṯā'yim* and mentions both his "low status" (v. 6b) and his "affliction" (v. 10).[37] Like other groups of lower status,

---

32. So, e.g., Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos*, 219, 246; a different view is taken, e.g., by Delitzsch, *Proverbs*, II, 34-35, 46.

33. → נחל *nḥl*.

34. → זור/זר *zûr/zār*, IV, 56-57.

35. See II.2 and esp. III below.

36. → שגג *šgg*.

37. → דל *dal*, III, 208ff.; → ענה *'nh* (II).

e.g., foreigners,[38] the *pᵉṯāʾyim* stand under Yahweh's special care: *šōmēr yhwh pᵉṯāʾyim.*[39] The idea that the *peṯî* is close to Yahweh and stands under his protection is especially evident in the LXX[40] and in Qumran[41] and continues to exert an influence in the NT.[42]

2. *Verb.* a. *Qal and Niphal.* Because the stupidity of the simple can result in thoughtless gossip, it is best not to trust such "fools" (*pth* qal ptcp.; Prov. 20:19; Sir. 8:17). Such foolishness (*pth* qal ptcp.) can also manifest itself in excited vexation and blind jealousy.[43] Such agitation, however, only disrupts a person's life and ultimately kills the "fool" (*pth* qal ptcp.; Job 5:2). Similarly, anyone who has lusted after his neighbor's wife has merely made a "fool" of himself "because of a woman" (*pth* niphal, Job 31:9), and the sexual immorality of an old man is nothing less than "foolishness" (*pth* qal ptcp., alongside *kᵉsîl*) that one should not hesitate to correct (Sir. 42:8).

The "heart," the capacity for reasonable thinking and intelligent action, would be "simple and foolish" (*pth* qal) were Israel to turn away from Yahweh to serve and worship other gods (Dt. 11:16). Because Ephraim seeks help in Egypt and Assyria, it is "like a dove, silly" (*pth* qal ptcp.) and "without sense" (*ʾên lēḇ,* Hos. 7:11). Just as wealth and gold blind people and lead to false confidence (cf. Sir. 34:5-7, *pth* qal ptcp., v. 7), so also can looking at the sunlight and the moon make the human heart "secretly" *(bassēṯer)* "stupid and foolish" enough (*pth* qal) to be false toward God (Job 31:24-28). Similarly, it is "naive and dumb" (Sir. 16:17-23; *pth* qal ptcp., v. 23) to think that God, to whom the entirety of creation is open, does not see all transgressions regardless of how secretly a person commits them (cf. Job 22:13-14; Ps. 10:4,11; 14:1; 53:2[1]; 94:7; 73:11; Isa. 29:15).

b. *Piel and Pual.* The Philistines ask Samson's wife, Delilah, to make a "fool" (*pth* piel) out of her husband, i.e., to put him into a position in which he is no longer master of himself; he will then reveal the answer to his riddle and betray the source of his power (Jgs. 14:15; 16:5). Joab believed that Abner did not come to David in good faith, but rather only to manipulate David into a state of relaxed naïveté (*pth* piel) to learn of his plans (2 S. 3:25). Micaiah son of Imlah reveals to the king of Israel that the latter's planned campaign will end in defeat (1 K. 22:17). To show that those among the king's prophets who promise victory in fact do not know and cannot speak the truth, he portrays a scene in heaven (1 K. 22:19-23) according to which Yahweh places a "lying spirit" *(rûaḥ šeqer)* into the mouths of these prophets. This spirit's words make a "fool" out of the king, making him incapable of seeing and doing what is necessary to

---

38. → גור *gûr,* II, 439ff.
39. → שמר *šmr.*
40. See I.3.
41. See IV.
42. See S. Légasse, "νήπιος," *EDNT,* II, 1142-43 (with bibliog.); for additional bibliog. see *TWNT,* X/2, 1186-87.
43. → כעס *kʿs,* VII, 282ff.; → קנא *qnʾ.*

avoid defeat (*pth* piel, vv. 20-22 par. 2 Ch. 18:19-21); as a result, he goes up and is defeated at Ramoth-gilead.

In Prov. 1:10-19 the wisdom teacher warns that sinners can make a person into a "fool" (*pth* piel, v. 10) such that the person then acts the way the sinners do and ends up in harm's way (cf. vv. 18-19). The "violent" (*'îš ḥāmās*) similarly make their neighbors into "fools" (*pth* piel) "and lead them in a way that is not good" (16:29). Jeremiah's adversaries hope that he can be made into a "fool" (*pth* pual) and will do something allowing them to take their revenge on him (Jer. 20:10).

The meaning of *pth* piel and pual in these passages is obvious; it means to manipulate a person into a position in which the person is no longer capable of holding his or her ground and as a result comes to harm. This understanding of *pth* piel also applies to Ex. 22:15(16), *wᵉḵî yᵉpatteh 'îš bᵉṯûlâ.* It is not the modern subjective and emotional aspect of seduction that stands in the foreground here, but rather the objective result (factitive piel[44]) of someone having made a girl compliant and thus "unwise" and "foolish" such that she is no longer capable of staying out of harm's way. The same applies to *pth* pual in Sir. 42:10.

One passage (Ps. 78:34-37) uses *pth* piel in association with an insincere relationship with Yahweh. After being chastised, the "fathers" made a "fool" out of Yahweh by turning to him once again only with their mouths rather than with their hearts (*pth* piel, par. → כזב *kzb*, v. 36). In Prov. 25:15 *pth* pual has been weakened to mean that with patience an overseer can be coaxed into being gentle and accommodating. Sir. 30:23 advises one to make one's own "soul" (*nepeš*) pliant and calm (*pth* piel, par. *pwg lēḇ*) so that anxiety and vexation (*qin'â;* cf. *qin'â* with *pth* qal in Job 5:2) do not shorten one's life.

III. *Pth* Piel with Yahweh as Subject. Yahweh is the subject of *pth* piel in three passages: Jer. 20:7; Ezk. 14:9; Hos. 2:16(14).

1. *Jer. 20:7.* In Jer. 20:7 *pth* piel and niphal are generally understood with reference to Ex. 22:15(16) in the sense of sexual-erotic seduction.[45] On this view Yahweh treated Jeremiah the way a seducer treats a young, inexperienced girl. This understanding emphasizes the process of *pth* more than the result, and within the process itself emphasizes in an acutely anthropomorphic fashion Yahweh's intention of consciously deceiving and seducing Jeremiah.

In and of itself, the root *pty/h* by no means evokes the notion of sexual-erotic seduction, and the piel of *pth* in its function as a verb of condition does refer to the attainment of a condition without regard for the sequence of events.[46] Nor can the parallel *ḥzq* qal in v. 7aβ be ascribed in and of itself to the semantic sphere of the erotic (only in the hiphil and only in one passage, Dt. 22:25, does *ḥzq* refer to the rape of a woman).

44. See I.1 above.
45. See, e.g., W. McKane, *Jeremiah. ICC,* 2 vols. (1986-96), I, 467-70 (with bibliog.).
46. See I.1 above.

The metaphor "seduction of a young girl" would thus represent a contextually inappropriate use. The immediate context of *pth* pual in Jer. 20:10 certainly contains no erotic components.[47] Nor did the author or redactor of vv. 7-9,10ff. understand *pth* piel and niphal in v. 7 from the perspective of the rather distant example in the Covenant Code in Ex. 22:15(16), but rather from that of *pth* pual in v. 10. Yet even discounting v. 10 in the present context, it is extremely unlikely that *pth* piel and niphal in v. 7 intend to evoke the notion of sexual-erotic seduction.

Hence *pth* piel and niphal can be understood more appropriately without recourse to Ex. 22:15(16). Here Jeremiah reproaches Yahweh for having made a "fool" out of him by calling him to be a prophet; because Jeremiah is now Yahweh's prophet, he is no longer able to perceive what is in his own best interest and thus to escape harm. This understanding of *pth* piel and niphal in v. 7aα fits well with v. 7aβ and with the continuation in v. 7b according to which Jeremiah has become a laughingstock and the object of mockery precisely for the sake of Yahweh's word (v. 8b). The entire objective severity of Jeremiah's reproach is thus clearly delineated; reference to Yahweh's anthropomorphic seductive inclination is superfluous, and the focus is solely on Jeremiah's own condition. His status as a prophet is inextricably tied to his status as *peṯî* in that because he is Yahweh's prophet, he has lost the capacity to deal with life (factitive), something now also publicly manifest (declarative-estimative).

2. *Ezk. 14:9.* In Ezk. 14:9aβ most modern translations and commentators and even the LXX and Vulg. understand the statement *'ᵃnî yhwh pittêṯî 'ēṯ hannāḇî' hahû'* to mean that Yahweh himself caused or occasioned the illicit and criticized prophetic proclamation to the idolatrous "elders of Israel" (v. 1). On this view *pittêṯî* would indicate past action. The statement in v. 9aβ is then generally associated with the so-called OT stubbornness sayings. This understanding of *pth* piel in v. 9aβ is, however, untenable.

Within the casuistic legal sequence of v. 9, one expects the description of the transgression in v. 9aα to be followed not by a statement of the motive leading up to the transgression, but by a pronouncement of sentence. Just as in vv. 4b,7b, so also does the emphatic *'ᵃnî yhwh* in v. 9aβ signal the beginning of the apodosis, and the immediately following *pittêṯî* can be understood no differently than the similarly perf. verbs *wᵉnāṭîṯî* and *wᵉhišmaḏtîw* immediately following in v. 9bβ. Like the latter, it too must refer to Yahweh's chastising reaction to the prophet's illicit behavior.

In a transposition employing a kind of wordplay, *pth* piel in v. 9aβ corresponds to *pth* pual in v. 9aα: a prophet allows himself to be made a "fool" by the idolatrous men who question him (*pth* pual); as a result, he illicitly imparts a response to them in Yahweh's name. Yahweh himself then makes a "fool" out of the prophet by presenting him as a "fool," albeit it in a different sense. Hence in v. 9aβ *pittêṯî* is to be translated as future or as present with a future sense: "I, Yahweh, will make a fool out of this prophet," i.e., I will cause him to become a fool [factitive] and be exposed to all as a

47. See II.2 above.

fool [declarative-estimative]. I will make him incapable of reacting wisely to situations such that he avoids harm, and will expose him as a 'fool.'"[48]

3. *Hos. 2:16(14).* In Hos. 2:16(14) the piel ptcp. *m^epatteyhā* is generally taken beyond the perf. *w^ehōlaḵtîhā hammiḏbār* and instead associated directly with the perf. *w^eḏibbartî 'al-libbāh* and then both understood in the erotic sense. The expression "speak to someone's heart," however, is not an idiom associated primarily with the sphere of the erotic.[49] One primary consideration is that the first explication and consequence of the *m^epatteh* is that Yahweh brings Israel into the wilderness (syndetic perfects used as consecutive clauses after a participle[50]). In this instance, however, the wilderness is, unlike Egypt or Assyria (cf. 8:13; 9:3; 11:5), the beneficent place of Israel's youth when it was still obedient and open to instruction (cf. 10:11, "a trained heifer that loved to thresh"; 11:1-4, Israel as a young son who, although still untutored, was nonetheless still open to instruction; cf. also 9:10; 12:10[9]).

Yahweh brings Israel back into the wilderness and speaks to her heart, making her into a *peṯî* (factitive piel); he leads Israel, who is now as stubborn as a stubborn heifer (Hos. 4:16) back into a condition in which she can be shaped and tutored. Here too the basic meaning of *pth* discussed above is preserved together with positive implications with regard to new instruction and formation.

IV. Qumran. In Qumran *peṯî* is generally associated with the inability to use good judgment such that a person is excluded either from full membership in the community or at least from positions of leadership (so esp. 1QSa and CD). At the same time, the *p^eṯā'yim* are those who do not have the knowledge of the community to which the community in its own turn would, however, like to introduce them (so esp. 1QH; 11QPs; 1QpNah; 1QpHab).[51] Such persons are both in need of and worthy of special care and concern. One passage even equates the *p^eṯā'îm* of Judah with "those who keep the law" (1QpHab 12:4-5).

Mosis

48. See Mosis, 163-71.

49. See G. Fischer, "Die Redewendung דבר על־לב im AT," *Bibl* 65 (1984) 244-50 (with bibliog.).

50. See JM, §119n; *GK*, §166a with §112n and t; or even with D. Michel, *Tempora und Satzstellung in den Psalmen* (Bonn, 1960), 95-99, who identifies them as an explication of the participial clause.

51. See Dupont (with bibliog.).

פָּתַח pāṯaḥ; פֶּתַח peṯaḥ; פְּתִיחָה pᵉṯîḥâ; מִפְתָּח mipṯāḥ; מַפְתֵּחַ mapṯēaḥ; פִּתּוּחַ pittûaḥ; פִּתָּחוֹן pittāḥôn

Contents: I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences; 3. Meaning; 4. Homonym *pth* II? 5. Semantic Field. II. OT Use: 1. Qal, Niphal; 2. Piel, Pual, Hithpael; 3. *peṯaḥ*. III. 1. LXX; 2. Sirach, Qumran, Later Judaism.

I. 1. *Etymology.* The Heb. term *pth* is a Biblical Hebrew or Aramaic root also attested with remarkable semantic consistency in most of the other Semitic languages. Virtually all occurrences of this root in the various Semitic dialects can be interpreted from the perspective of the generally accepted basic meaning "to open." Concrete occurrences outside the Bible and Qumran are found in Akkadian *(petû/patû),*[1] Old Aramaic,[2] Arabic (*fataḥa,* also meaning "to conquer"), Old South Arabic (*ftḥ,* "to conquer, lay waste," "to judge"),[3] Ethiopic (*fatḥa,* "to open, resolve, judge"),[4] Egyptian Aramaic,[5] inscriptional Hebrew,[6] Jewish Aramaic,[7] Mandaic (*pth* [par. *pta/pht*]),[8] Nabatean,[9] Palmyrene,[10] Phoenician,[11] Punic,[12] Syriac *(pᵉṯaḥ),*[13] and Ugaritic.[14] The root also occurs as a Semitic loanword in Egyptian.[15]

2. *Occurrences.* In the OT the root *pth* occurs 327 times in Hebrew and twice in Aramaic. Among these, 144 Hebrew and both Aramaic occurrences of *pth* use verbal forms, whereas 183 use nominal derivatives. Among those passages using nominal forms, 165 use the noun *peṯaḥ* (and once *pēṯaḥ*), representing almost half of all occurrences of the root. Other nominal constructions are of less significance, including *pᵉṯîḥâ,* "drawn weapon" (twice), *mapṯēaḥ,* "key" (3 times), *mipṯāḥ,* "opening" (once),

---

pāṯaḥ. M. Dahood, "Hebrew and Ugaritic Equivalents of Accadian *pitû purîda,*" *Bibl* 39 (1958) 67-69; J. Jeremias, "θύρα," *TDNT,* III, 173-80; P. Marrassini, "פתח 'aprire' etc.," *Quaderni di Semitistica* 1 (Florence, 1971) 30-32; O. Procksch, "λύω," *TDNT,* IV, 328-35; H. Schult, "Vergleichende Studien zur alttestamentlichen Namenkunde" (diss., Bonn, 1967).

1. *AHw,* II, 858-61b.
2. *KAI* 224.8-9; Tablets in the Harvard Semitic Museum, 7, 33, 82; *APN,* 92a; *ATDA,* 258.
3. Biella, 417; Beeston, 47.
4. *LexLingAeth,* 1364-65.
5. *AP* 5.14; 25.6; *BMAP* 9.13; 12.21; Ahiqar 178.
6. N. Avigad, "The Epitaph of a Royal Steward," *IEJ* 3 (1953) 143.
7. *LOT,* II, 660; Beyer, 320, V, 45, 4.
8. *MdD,* 384b (383b).
9. *CIS,* II, 211, 226, 271.
10. *CIS,* II, 4218.
11. *DNSI,* II, 948-49; *KAI* 10.4,5; 27.23.
12. *DNSI,* II, 948-49.
13. *LexSyr,* 296b.
14. *UT,* no. 2130; M. Dahood, *RSP,* I, 318, no. 472.
15. *WbÄS,* I, 565.

pittāḥôn, "opening" (twice), and *pittûaḥ*, "etching, engraving" (11 times), with some scholars deriving the last from the presumed homonym *ptḥ* II.

Among the 144 verbal occurrences in Hebrew, 97 are in the qal, 18 in the niphal, 27 in the piel, and one each in the pual and hithpael, counting the 9 occurrences of the alleged homonym *ptḥ* II (8 times in the piel, once in the pual). Both Aramaic occurrences, Dnl. 6:11(Eng. 10); 7:10, represent the passive of the basic stem (peil).

In the case of the verb, no particular biblical books seem to prefer this root, and the relatively frequent use of the verb in Isaiah (21 times) is probably merely fortuitous. Quite the opposite is the case with the noun *peṯaḥ;* around three-fifths of all occurrences (93) are found in Exodus, Numbers, and Ezekiel, where they are concentrated even more specifically in passages involving a sanctuary (Exodus, Numbers) or the holy city Jerusalem and its sanctuary (Ezekiel). The simple statistical evidence here suggests that alongside a general secular use in various contexts, the noun also had a specifically theological use as well.

3. *Meaning.* In the qal the verb is always associated with the opening of a previously closed object or with the "opening up" of an abstract entity, such as the resolution of a riddle (Ps. 49:5[4]). The assumption of a basic meaning "to open" seems to be correct. In this meaning *ptḥ* can be variously construed, e.g., with or without an (in)direct object, with or without *nota accusativi,* and similarly as a passive participle. Despite these various possibilities, nowhere do any significant differences in meaning emerge. The postulated semantic nucleus is able to explain even the few cases in which the root is used metaphorically (Ps. 37:14; Ezk. 21:33[28]; Mic. 5:5[6] [cj.][16]) in reference to an "opened," i.e., "drawn," sword or to the parallel nominative derivative *pᵉṯîḥâ,* "drawn weapon." The same applies to the niphal. The three additional derivatives from the qal (niphal) (*peṯaḥ, mipṯāḥ,* and *mapṯēaḥ*) can also be understood from the perspective of the basic meaning "to open." Here the noun *peṯaḥ* probably referred first to the concrete opening of a nomad's tent, i.e., to the tent's entrance and exit, and then to any form of opening granting access between "outside" and "inside" (or the reverse). The constructions with a prefixed *m* represent the abstract and instrumental nouns.

4. *Homonym ptḥ II?* A different situation emerges regarding the stems with doubling. Although the majority of occurrences can indeed be explained in the sense of a resultative use of the root ("make open, liberate, loose"), 9 passages remain for which no consensus yet exists. The more prominent lexicons (*GesB, KBL*², *HAL*) accept the presence of a root *ptḥ* II for these cases, a root either understood as a denominative construction from the primary noun *pittûaḥ*[17] or derived from Akk. *patāḫu(m),* "break through, bore through"[18] (cf. OSA *ftḥ,* "engrave"[19]). By contrast, these same occur-

16. *BHS;* also H. W. Wolff, *Micah* (Eng. trans. 1990), 132.

17. *HP,* 163-64.

18. Ibid., 245; *AHw,* II, 846-47.

19. Biella, 419; a different view is taken by M. Görg, "Ein problematisches Wort der Siloah-Inschrift," *BN* 11 (1980) 24-25, who adduces Coptic and Egyptian terminology.

rences appear in the concordances of both Mandelkern and Even-Shoshan amid the other occurrences of the root, a decision probably more in accordance with the actual state of affairs concerning this root. That one and the same root can mean "to open" in the qal and "bore through, engrave" in the piel may derive from a phenomenon described by E. Jenni but ignored in the case of *ptḥ,* namely, that verbs exhibiting a relatively broad semantic spectrum in the qal sometimes exhibit a specialized "technical meaning in the area of construction trades or artistic handicrafts." Moreover, it is worth noting that *ptḥ* is used twice in connection with the opening of the womb (Gen. 29:31; 30:22).[20] It is thus possible that the root *ptḥ,* analogous, e.g., to *bô'* with its unmistakable secondary sexual meaning, was also used in sexual contexts. Some scholars have adduced the initiation rites of the Canaanite fertility cult in interpreting the PNs Petachya and Jiphtah/Iphtah[21] or the place-name Jiphthah-el/Iphtahel.[22] Cant. 7:14(13) offers an example of this meaning using a substantive.[23] The route from this sexual connotation to the technical meaning "bore through, engrave" is not difficult to follow.

5. *Semantic Field.* One occasional parallel to *ptḥ* is the root → פקח *pqḥ* (e.g., Isa. 35:5), which is used almost exclusively in reference to opening one's eyes (the exception being Isa. 42:20),[24] while in a reverse fashion *ptḥ* seems to be associated with "eyes" only in the passive participle. Other (partial) semantic parallels include → רחב *rḥb* hiphil and especially → גלה *glh* piel; the first refers more to the size of the erstwhile opening, while the second emphasizes that something previously hidden is now revealed or opened up. By contrast, *ptḥ* refers to the free interchange between an "outside" and an "inside" (and the reverse). An analogous situation also applies to the antonyms to these three roots. The immediate antonym of *rḥb* hiphil is → צרר *ṣrr* qal I/hiphil ("hem in, oppress"), while that of *glh* piel is כסה *kāsâ* ("cover") or → סתר *sāṯar* ("hide, conceal"); the antonym to *ptḥ* is the root → סגר *sāḡar* ("close") (cf. Gen. 7:16/8:6; Job 12:14; Isa. 22:22; 45:1; 60:11; Jer. 13:19; Ezk. 44:2).

II. OT Use.

1. *Qal, Niphal.* Given the general nature of the root's basic meaning, it is not surprising to find that the contexts in which *ptḥ* appears in the qal and niphal are extremely varied, with the spectrum extending from theologically central events, such as the empowerment of the prophet Ezekiel to proclaim God's word (Ezk. 3:27), to common daily activities, such as opening a grain sack (e.g., Gen. 42:27), or from political and military contexts (e.g., Dt. 20:11) to intimate love scenes (Cant. 5:2ff.). Among the objects most commonly associated with this root, the words "mouth" and "gate/door" occur almost the same number of times (22 and 21, respectively); adding contexts with

---

20. See *KAI* 27.23.

21. L. Rost, "Erwägungen zu Hosea 4,13f.," *FS A. Bertholet* (Tübingen, 1950), 456-57.

22. H. Schult, 120; a different view is taken by W. Rudolph, "Präparierte Jungfrauen? (Zu Hosea 1)," *ZAW* 75 (1963) 66-67.

23. See O. Keel, *Song of Songs* (Eng. trans. 1994), 260.

24. See E. Jenni, "עַיִן *'ayin,* eye," *TLOT,* II, 877.

other body parts (15 times with lips, eyes, ears, hands) and objects from construction contexts (11 times with windows, hatches, storehouses, treasure chambers, cities), one finds that exactly three-fifths of all occurrences of the qal/niphal are associated with objects from these two spheres. To these contexts one can add those with analogous use of substantive derivatives.

Three areas of use emerge in connection with the notion of "opening one's mouth" (discounting Josh. 10:22, which uses → פה *peh* in the extended sense as a reference to the "entrance" [to a cave] in connection with the technical procedure of opening the cave at Makkedah). The first is the legal sphere, the second includes "elevated" language especially in wisdom circles, and the third is a specifically theological use found especially in Ezekiel. The first and second groups are difficult to differentiate in any precise sense because 5 of the 8 occurrences in the legal sphere derive originally from the wisdom tradition. One isolated case, Ezk. 21:27, is difficult to classify because it is also hampered by text-critical problems (cf. *BHS*).

The expression "open one's mouth" circumscribes the opening of discourse in a legal proceeding (e.g., with reference to Job in Job 3:1, and to Elihu in 33:2). An analogous situation obtains, albeit in the first case with negative implications, when the petitioner in Ps. 109:2 laments that enemies have opened "deceitful mouths" against him, or when Lemuel is twice commanded to open his mouth for those who cannot speak or for the justice and rights of the poor and needy (Prov. 31:8,9). This context probably also includes Ezk. 16:63, where Yahweh tells Jerusalem he will forgive her after all, but admonishes: "never open your mouth again because of your shame" (expressed here nominally as *piṯḥôn peh*). The expression "open one's mouth" is attested especially as a reference to making a statement or objection in legally difficult situations not only in Job 3:1 and Prov. 31:8,9, but especially also in Ps. 38:14(13); 39:10(9); Isa. 53:7, which speak of not making such objections that are both legally admissible and, in the last case, certainly expected. From a legal perspective, it is extremely unusual for Yahweh's servant to take the sins of all others onto himself and willingly to suffer all the attendant punishments, so unusual that the author felt constrained to provide two comparisons from the animal world to explicate the situation. The reason for the absence of such objection is in any case clear enough even though in Isa. 53 it is not directly articulated as in Ps. 39:10(9), namely, that because Yahweh has ordained it, there can be no objection. This theological position, of course, is also found in Job, though there it is only at the end of the book that it constitutes the result of Job's dispute with God and with his friends (Job 42:2-6). Prov. 24:7 shows that the expression "open one's mouth" in the sense of a legal technical term was not an artificial theological creation, but was rather originally at home in the secular legal sphere: "Wisdom is too high for fools; in the gate [court] they do not open their mouths."

This expression appears in wisdom writings as an elevated substitute for "speak." Passages such as Prov. 31:26 and Ps. 78:2 use the expression in this way, and probably also Ps. 49:5(4); the substantive relationship between the two "wisdom psalms"[25] sug-

25. H. Gunkel, *Die Psalmen. HKAT* II/2 ([5]1968), 209ff., 340ff.

gests that 49:5(4) is using an ellipse in which (for metrical reasons?) a *peh* has been deleted. When the wisdom teacher says that the capable wife "opens her mouth with wisdom," he can hardly be referring to an appearance in the legal forum, since only the woman's husband was allowed to appear there (Prov. 31:23); the reference is more likely to her pedagogical activity in a household where higher education is valued. The contexts in Ps. 78:2 and 49:5(4) also preclude any reference to legal activity. The first introduces a hymnic account of Yahweh's salvific deeds, while the second involves a fundamental anthropological discussion. In both contexts elevated language can be used without any legal reference.

"Elevated" language in the broader sense, though more "poetic" than "wisdom" related, also occurs in Nu. 16:32; 26:10; Ps. 106:17, here in an elliptical formulation (again for metrical reasons?) without *peh,* as the earth is said to have opened up its "mouth" and swallowed up the gang of Korah (or Dathan and Abiram). Ezk. 3:27 is of particular significance among passages using this expression in a specifically theological context: Yahweh himself explicitly empowers Ezekiel as a prophet by opening Ezekiel's mouth. In 3:2 the symbolic act seems to imply that after eating the scroll (and opening his own mouth in the process), the prophet as it were carries the entire revelation within himself; by contrast, this passage now makes clear that this revelation is not freely accessible to the prophet, who after all is still merely a *ben-'āḏām,* a human being. Even after the prophetic appointment, it must still always be Yahweh himself who opens the prophet's mouth by specifically commissioning him to use the formula *kōh-'āmar yhwh* in mediating the erstwhile concrete message to the "rebellious house." The concluding "late interpretation" of the book[26] has thus taken a statement originally associated with the symbolic act of temporary silence lasting until Jerusalem's fall (24:27; 33:22) and also associated with a concrete event (29:21, albeit with the nominal expression *piṯḥôn-peh,* in connection with *nāṯan*), and generalized it in a programmatic fashion. This postinterpretation now asserts that although a *general* empowerment for prophetic proclamation and action is indeed given with the prophet's original call, any *immediate* practice of that empowerment still depends on Yahweh's own initiative rather than the prophet's.

The use of this expression in the story of Balaam's donkey (Nu. 22:28) follows the same basic external sequence, albeit in a theologically and religio-historically different setting whose literary character is especially different. When Yahweh opens the donkey's mouth, the donkey, like Ezekiel, has already perceived things not normally accessible to mortals, not even to "seers." Yet only Yahweh's own direct intervention makes it possible for the donkey actually to utter the message, albeit in the roundabout form of a maieutic question for the sake of advancing the narrative.

The context in Dnl. 10:16 is different yet, though perhaps theologically closer to Ezekiel. Commensurate with the theology of the late OT period, it is one of the "(angelic) princes" rather than Yahweh who touches Daniel's mouth, enabling the apocalyptist, who had gone silent in the face of the terrible vision or audition, to open

26. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), 161, 177-78.

his mouth and speak again. What in Ezekiel was still a theologically central feature has in Daniel become an element merely augmenting the portrayal of apocalyptic horror.

It is not surprising that the expression "open one's lips" is used in much the same way as "open one's mouth." The three passages using this expression can be classified according to the first group mentioned above (so Job 11:5; 32:20) or simultaneously according to the second and third groups (so Ps. 51:17[15]: "O Lord, open my lips, and my mouth will declare your praise") without any essentially new features becoming discernible. The only passage using the abstract noun *miptāḥ* (Prov. 8:6) also belongs to the second group when it has "wisdom" use "speaking" and "opening one's lips" parallel. It is noteworthy that not only human beings can be said to open their lips (Job 32:20, Elihu), but also God himself (Job 11:5).

Among the other expressions using this root with terms referring to body parts, only those with "eye" exhibit any specifically theological use. In all 6 passages, it is Yahweh who is petitioned (or who promises) to keep his eyes open over the temple or Solomon's or Nehemiah's prayer (1 K. 8:29 par. 2 Ch. 6:20; 1 K. 8:52 par. 2 Ch. 6:40; Neh. 1:6; 2 Ch. 7:15 formulates the expression as Yahweh's own promise). Since the verb normally associated with opening one's "eyes" is *pqḥ* rather than *ptḥ*, the author seems to have consciously chosen an unusual term in order to weaken the anthropomorphic associations in the prayer to Yahweh.

Essentially the same situation as in Ezk. 3:27 is found in Isa. 50:5, where the servant asserts that Yahweh has opened his ear, "and I was not rebellious, I did not turn backward"; the difference is that here the emphasis shifts from the mediation of the message to obedience to it. (Israel is reproached for precisely the opposite behavior shortly before [Isa. 48:8; piel in the MT, while 1QIsa[a] probably correctly has the qal].) Isa. 35:5 moves in a different direction in asserting that the eyes of the blind will be opened *(pqḥ)* and the ears of the deaf unstopped *(ptḥ)*; the suspension of all suffering at the end of days is portrayed in simple, vivid imagery. Whereas the use of *ptḥ* in the last example points to the future, the psalm passages from the wisdom tradition (Ps. 104:28; 145:16) both speak of Yahweh's beneficence in the present world. Yahweh opens his hand and fills all that lives with good things. Analogously, Dt. 15:8,11 are thinking of the present time in exhorting readers to open their hands, "willingly lending enough to meet the need." Yet while the opening of Yahweh's hand focuses on pure giving, the opening of human hands in 15:8 refers to mere lending. Although the wording in 15:11 itself leaves open the question whether the reference is to genuine gifts or to loans, the context, which deals with the sabbatical year of remission, rather suggests the latter.

Among expressions using *ptḥ* with objects from the area of building and construction, those with "city" and "gate/door" are essentially semantic equivalents in that both often refer to the political and military question of whether a city or its gates are open or closed. This context also includes Yahweh's metaphorical announcement that he will "lay open" Moab's flank (Ezk. 25:9), the following text making clear that the reference is to cities. Two of the passages using the root without an object can also be included here (Dt. 20:11; 2 K. 15:16); indeed, the code of warfare to which Dt. 20:11 belongs mentions the obj. "town" shortly before using this expression, and in 2 K. 15:16

it is clear that the city Tiphsah (LXX Tirzah) or its inhabitants[27] did not want to open their gates to Menahem. Passages such as Josh. 8:17 and Neh. 7:3 that use the root with an object are generally making purely strategic references. The inhabitants of Ai fall for Joshua's trickery and leave their city open (i.e., unprotected) when they see the Israelites flee. By contrast, Nehemiah allows Jerusalem's gates to be opened only during the heat of the day in order to protect against surprise attacks by Tobiah or Sanballat. It is unclear to what extent the announcement that Nineveh's gates will be opened (to its enemies; Nah. 2:7[6]; 3:13) exhibits a theological aspect alongside the military-chauvinistic one; in any event the oracle of threat in 2:4ff.(3ff.) does employ certain elements associated with the tradition of Yahweh's wars. Probably only the political aspect is in focus in 3:13, which plays off an analogy with the city of Thebes (in Egypt). Zech. 11:1 is intended similarly; Lebanon is (metaphorically) exhorted to open its doors "so that fire may devour your cedars."

Jer. 13:19 is probably also meant in a broader political-strategic sense, except that here the categories "inside" and "outside" are used in the opposite sense. The king and queen mother have lost their "crown" *(HAL),* the symbol of power, and now there is no longer anyone who can open up the towns in the southern part of the country; i.e., the Davidic ruling house has lost all authority over them.

Isa. 45:1 takes a completely different position in establishing a direct link between the theological and political dimensions. Deutero-Isaiah finds Yahweh's election of Cyrus as his anointed confirmed in Yahweh's decision to "open doors before him" such that "gates shall not be closed"; indeed, Yahweh will even disarm other kings before him (*ptḥ* piel). Isa. 22:22 reveals the full theological significance of what this passage only indirectly addresses: this bestowal of the "office of the keys" directly authorizes these claims to power. This office includes the capacity to open without any other person closing, and to close without any other person opening (formulated in reference to "Yahweh's servant" Eliakim [without a direct object], according to the text a governor of the palace at the Davidic court on whose "shoulders" the key [*mapṯēaḥ*] of the Davidic house is laid, though in reality probably an eschatological figure;[28] cf. also 1 Ch. 9:27, which deals with the hierarchy among the Levites, and in the NT also Mt. 16:18-19[29]).

We now see, however, that Jer. 13:19 can also be understood theologically in its focus on the withdrawal of the authority over Judah that Yahweh once bestowed on the Davidic house, i.e., on nothing less than a revocation of Nathan's prophecy. The inconspicuous remark in Neh. 13:19 that Nehemiah orders Jerusalem's gates not to be opened until after the sabbath now proves to be a significant statement indeed. The book's conclusion summarizes and underscores what the book has already empha-

---

27. See *BHK; BHS* does not address the problem of the third person masc. sg.

28. See O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 13–39. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1974), 156.

29. See U. Rüterswörden, *Die Beamten der israelitischen Königszeit. BWANT* 117 (1985), 79-80, who does, however, argue only from the perspective of the titles without acknowledging the significance of the verbal statement.

sized, namely, that in the rebuilt city of Jerusalem, Nehemiah is the sole legitimate holder of both spiritual and secular power.

This context also includes the 6 passages dealing with opening the gates to the sanctuary. It is probably no accident that only after Yahweh's appointment of Samuel does the author recount, in a style reserved for individual matters, that Samuel, as Yahweh's (or Eli's) servant, is in charge of opening the doors of Yahweh's house (1 S. 3:15). This account apparently articulates the acceptance of the "office of the keys"; the power to open the doors of Yahweh's house makes Samuel Eli's authorized and legitimate successor. 2 Ch. 29:3 recounts that Hezekiah opened the doors of Yahweh's house and emphasizes that he did so in the first month of the first year of his reign. The function of this statement is apparently to qualify Hezekiah as a legitimate cultic reformer and ruler by referring implicitly to the "office of the keys" he held. Finally, Ezekiel's draft constitution is not really concerned with who might be permitted to open the sanctuary's otherwise perpetually closed east gate, but rather merely with the person for whom and the purpose for which such is permitted (Ezk. 44:2; 46:1[bis],12). Nonetheless, this and the previous texts are closely related insofar as the prerogative of the *nāśî'* to present special voluntary sabbath or new moon offerings shows the high esteem in which the people held him.

Ps. 118:19 and Isa. 26:2 are concerned less with active opening of gates than with entry through gates that are apparently guarded. The exhortation to open in Ps. 118:19 constitutes an analogy for entry liturgies associated with the temple in requesting entry through the "gates of righteousness," i.e., a just verdict.[30] Isa. 26:2 speaks of the entry of the "righteous nation" into the new Jerusalem after Yahweh's day of judgment. Significantly, neither passage contains an "asseveration of innocence";[31] rather both presuppose that at some point in the past such occasion for Yahweh's "chastisement" did indeed exist. The petitioner and apocalyptist, however, now assume that the time of Yahweh's "negative" actions will someday end, and that the gates to a salvific future will then be opened wide. Indeed, the continuation of the book of Isaiah assumes that Jerusalem's gates will remain open forever (Isa. 60:11; MT piel; cj. with *BHK/BHS:* niphal). Taking as its point of departure the liturgical formula of temple entrance liturgies, the notion of the gates opening or remaining open has become a metaphor for salvation itself.

The remaining passages that speak of opening gates and doors do not exhibit any immediately discernible common features. Another theologically relevant dimension is addressed when in an "oath of purification" Job defends his own innocence by pointing out how he has always kept his door open to the stranger and traveler (Job 31:32); the notion of "keeping doors open" is of ethical significance in interpersonal relationships. Certain features in 2 K. 9:3,10 also still allude to a theological dimension. The disciple of the company of prophets is to flee through the (abruptly) opened door be-

---

30. See K. Koch, "Tempeleinlassliturgien und Dekaloge," *Studien zur Theologie der alttestamentlichen Überlieferungen. FS G. von Rad* (Neukirchen, 1961), 45-60.

31. Ibid., 49-50.

hind which he has secretly anointed Jehu, an absurd gesture probably anticipating symbolically the quick spread of Jehu's revolution. Once the reality established by Yahweh's initiative has arrived in the world, it cannot remain hidden, and inexorably seeks to actualize itself. By contrast, both Jgs. 3:25, which uses the root twice in verbal forms and once in a substantive form, and Jgs. 19:27 involve blatantly secular scenes; the bizarre scene involving Eglon of Moab uses the expression in an almost unnerving fashion compared to the previous passages.

In Ps. 78:23 the psalmist traces the miracle of the manna back to God's having opened the doors of heaven, an image similar to that in Mal. 3:10, which in reference to the blessing of the end time anticipates that Yahweh will (once again) open the "windows" *('ᵃrubbôṯ)* of heaven. Here the various expressions drawn from construction and building seem virtually interchangeable. Yahweh will open his rich storehouse *('ôṣār)* to give rain (Dt. 28:12) or his armory to provide arms against Babylon (Jer. 50:25). All these passages involve Yahweh's intervention on behalf of Israel. It is equally clear both that the expression in Mal. 3:10 represents the conscious reversal of a passage in the P account of the flood (Gen. 7:11) and that the Isaiah apocalypse uses the latter expression in a slightly altered form to illustrate the horrors of judgment (Isa. 24:18).

The 4 passages involving the opening of windows offer nothing essentially new in this regard. Noah opens the ark's window to release the raven or dove in a gesture too obvious to warrant the attribution of any special (symbolic?) value. 2 K. 13:17 does use symbolism when Elisha has Joash open a window toward the east and shoot an arrow through it, a symbolic act announcing a turn in the fortunes of war. By contrast, Dnl. 6:11(10) touches on an extremely important phenomenon in the history of religions in its reference to the direction of prayer (qiblah). The final passage in this series is purely secular; the opening of Babylon's granaries is evoked as part of the conquest of the city (Jer. 50:26).

Given the secular content, one can ignore the remaining passages that speak of opening or of keeping open various vessels (Gen. 42:27; 43:21; 44:11; Ex. 2:6; Nu. 19:15; Jgs. 4:19; Jer. 5:16), documents (Dnl. 7:10; Neh. 6:5; 8:5), loincloths (in the sense of defenselessness, so with *lō'* in Isa. 5:27), or a cistern (Ex. 21:33), or that compare the throats of the enemy with open graves (Ps. 5:10[9]). This group probably also includes Job's metaphorical assertion that in his earlier, happy life he had "opened" his roots to the water (Job 29:19). Neh. 8:5 has a certain degree of liturgical significance with its assertion that the postexilic community stood up when Ezra opened the book of the law. Nor does any real theological significance attach to the 8 passages that elliptically do not actually mention the object of such opening (Gen. 41:56; Am. 8:5, a granary;[32] Job 32:19, wineskins), or allow them only to be intimated (Isa. 14:17, prison gates;[33] Isa. 45:8, the earth opens its "body";[34] Cant. 5:2,5,6, the door of a house or chamber).

---

32. See H. W. Wolff, *Joel and Amos. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1977), 327.

33. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27* (Eng. trans. 1997), 46.

34. Cf. G. R. Driver, "Hebrew Notes," *VT* 1 (1951) 243; *BHS* cj. niphal; K. Elliger, "Dubletten im Bibeltext," *A Light unto My Path. FS J. M. Myers* (Philadelphia, 1974), 136-37, believes this represents a scribal error for *taprîaḥ*.

A completely different situation arises, of course, when Yahweh himself is either indirectly or directly the subject of such opening. The notion that the heavens are opened for visions (Ezk. 1:1) corresponds mutatis mutandis to the use of "open" in Mal. 3:10 and similar passages. Celestial spheres otherwise closed off to a human perception must be opened in some extraordinary fashion for a person to learn anything about Yahweh. By contrast, this-worldly events are involved in two metaphorical expressions presupposing Yahweh as the initiator of the action. Yahweh is able to "open up" the disaster from the north (i.e., have it "break forth"; Jer. 1:14) or to release prisoners (Isa. 51:14).

Gen. 29:31; 30:22; Ezk. 37:12,13 mention similarly secular but certainly no less unusual or even extraordinary events. That Yahweh opens up Leah's or Rachel's womb may indeed appear as a mere metaphorical expression for Yahweh's compassion with the previously childless women, though compared with the promise to Abraham or Hannah one does notice that these passages consciously speak about Yahweh's concrete intervention. The opening of graves in the sense of revivification is an act certainly transcending anything normal human action and thinking are capable of performing.[35] Finally, Yahweh's extraordinary acts also include the account in Ps. 105:41 of Yahweh (rather than Moses as in Ex. 17:6) opening the rock and allowing water to gush out; over the course of subsequent tradition or interpretive history, several different authors picked up and developed this theme typologically (e.g., Isa. 41:18, which speaks elliptically about the "opening" of rivers on bare rock; Zech. 13:1 is probably indirectly making the same assertion, and the nominal form [*peṯaḥ*] is used in Ezk. 47:1ff.).

The point of all these statements is that by opening things that normally cannot be opened, Yahweh shows himself to be the true God (explicitly so in the "expanded proof saying" in Ezk. 37:13[36]). In a reverse fashion, no one can open what God has closed (Job 12:14, no obj.). By similarly juxtaposing the terms in connection with the installation of a ruler, Isa. 22:22 discloses the deeper meaning of the antithetical expression. The simple use of the oppositional pair "open/close," like other comparable antitheses or antinomies, circumscribes in a theologically succinct fashion God's universality and, here, especially his omnipotence.

2. *Piel, Pual, Hithpael.* Among the occurrences of *ptḥ* with doubling, 8 of the 9 occurrences in technical contexts do not really exhibit any theological aspects (5 of these occurrences also use the noun *pittûaḥ* paronomastically), though in each instance the act of engraving is carried out on an important cultic object, and occasionally the engraving itself is theologically significant. For example, the names of Israel's tribes are engraved on the onyx stones attached to the priest's ephod (Ex. 28:9,11; 39:6; expressed by the noun in 39:14). The gold engraving "Holy to Yahweh" is part of the ro-

---

35. See R. Bartelmus, "Ez 37,1-14, die Verbform *wᵉqatal* und die Anfänge der Auferstehungshoffnung," *ZAW* 97 (1985) 366-89.

36. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1983), 257.

sette fastened to the front of the priest's turban (Ex. 28:36; expressed by the noun in 39:30). The priest's breastplate is also adorned with engravings of "the names of the sons of Israel" (Ex. 28:21, expressed by the noun). By contrast, less significance attaches to the production of the figurines on the cultic stands in Solomon's temple (1 K. 7:36) and of the cherubim on the temple walls (2 Ch. 3:7), or to the general references to such production in connection with plans for the temple construction (2 Ch. 2:6,13[7,14]) or the use of the noun in the remaining 2 passages (1 K. 6:29; Ps. 74:6).

Zech. 3:9 seems considerably more significant for two reasons. First, it is Yahweh himself who deals with the stone he has set before the high priest Joshua; second, the passage seems to make a smooth transition between the technical and more general use of the root in the piel. This transition is all the more skillfully employed if, as is often the case in late prophecy, the author is using a wordplay here in which the consonants are intended ambivalently both in the sense of "engravings" (MT) and, with different pointing, as "openings" (LXX).[37] On this view Yahweh is not only inscribing the stone commensurate with Ex. 32:16 and 34:1, but is simultaneously opening it in analogy to Ps. 105:41, making it into the original source of the eschatological temple spring (cf. Ezk. 47:1ff.; Joel 3:18; Zech. 14:8, where v. 10, which looks forward to future fruitfulness and is generally regarded as secondary,[38] would then fit well into this context). In any event *ptḥ* is clearly used here once more in reference to Yahweh's extraordinary acts.

The remaining occurrences of the doubled stems, apart from those treated as qal/niphal (Isa. 48:8; 60:11; cj. *BHS*),[39] emphasize a feature previously discernible only peripherally (Isa. 51:14). Among the objects to be "ungirded, loosened," the semantic field of "captured, bound" objects seems to predominate. In the secular sphere, objects such as camels (Gen. 24:32), weapons (1 K. 20:11), or clothing (Isa. 20:2, at Yahweh's behest) can be "ungirded." In one instance the reference is to the opening of blossoms (Cant. 7:13[12]; although G. Gerleman suggests that the expression is probably a succinct technical expression used by gardeners, it is more likely yet another example with sexual connotations).[40] Only in Isa. 28:24 does this meaning not fit, especially since there is no object. Given the context, the reference must be to three substantively related farming activities. Because the preceding reference is to plowing, and the following one to harrowing, the other must presumably be to "digging over" or "furrowing" (NRSV "open").[41]

---

37. E. Lipiński, "Recherches sûr le livre de Zacharie," *VT* 20 (1970) 28-29; a different view is taken by W. Rudolph, *Haggai — Sacharja 1–8 — Sacharja 9–14 — Maleachi. KAT* XIII/4 (1976), 101.

38. See K. Galling, "Serubbabel und der Wiederaufbau von Jerusalem," *Verbannung und Heimkehr. FS W. Rudolph* (Tübingen, 1961), 92-93.

39. Treated as passive qal together with Ps. 109:2 and Cant. 7:13(12) according to M. Dahood, *Proverbs and North West Semitic Philology. Scripta Pontificii Instituti Biblici* 113 (1963) 8 n. 4; and J. J. Scullion, "Some Difficult Texts in Isaiah cc. 56–66 in the Light of Modern Scholarship," *UF* 4 (1972) 116.

40. G. Gerleman, *Ruth/Das Hohelied. BK* XVIII (^{2}1981), 205.

41. *HP*, 202.

When Nebuzaradan frees Jeremiah from his fetters (Jer. 40:4), his motivation is less the ethical-religious impetus fixed in Isa. 58:6 according to which such humane acts are more important than cultic acts (fasting), but more likely his acknowledgment that Jeremiah has always spoken out against the rebellion against Babylon. All remaining occurrences of *ptḥ* piel/hithpael with lexemes from this semantic field reflect to a greater or lesser degree the central position occupied by the notion of "liberation" in the Yahweh religion. It makes little substantive difference whether Yahweh himself loosens the bonds (Job 12:18 [cj. with *BHK* or *HAL*]; Ps. 102:21[20]; 105:20; 116:16), or whether he exhorts Jerusalem to free itself from its bonds (Isa. 52:2). An act of liberation in the broader sense is also involved when the psalmist thanks Yahweh for having loosed the mourning garment (Ps. 30:12[11]). It is only a short step from these statements to the three rhetorical questions found in the divine discourse of the book of Job articulating Job's own human limitations or, from the other side, God's majesty. Job is asked whether he, as a man, is able to loose the cords of Orion or open the throat of Leviathan, or whether it was he who let the wild ass go free (Job 38:31; 41:6[14]; 39:5). Yahweh is similarly able to disarm kings (Isa. 45:1; see above). Even an obscure passage such as Job 30:11 fits easily into this context. Although it is not quite clear what kind of bond or cord God has "loosed" for Job (the only passage in which God's "loosing" has a negative result for a person[42]), it is clear that the only one capable of genuinely loosing (bonds) is God.

3. *peṯaḥ*. Two broader areas of usage emerge in the secular use of *peṯaḥ*, the first of which can be characterized in a preliminary fashion by *peṯaḥ bêṯ*, the second by *peṯaḥ ša'ar*. By contrast, the expression combining both terms, *peṯaḥ ša'ar bêṯ*, occurs only in theological contexts, and even there only 3 times, in reference to the temple (Jer. 36:10; Ezk. 8:14; 10:19). The first group refers to openings (entries and exits) in houses (or tents), the second to the same phenomenon in cities accessed by gates *(ša'ar)*. In the second group the more precise expression *peṯaḥ ša'ar* in reference to the actual thoroughfare in the gate structure as distinguished from defensive or other structures[43] can also be abbreviated as simply *peṯaḥ* (with *hā'îr* or similar terms) and by itself refer to the object "gate" (e.g., 1 K. 17:10).

The actual opening or conduit through the gate is always the strategically critical point in any city's layout[44] (Jgs. 9:35,40,44,52; 18:16,17; 2 S. 10:8; 11:23; 2 K. 7:3; 1 Ch. 19:9; possibly also Isa. 13:2 MT, in which case the "gate of the volunteers" would be the place where the volunteers assembled by Yahweh gain entry into the city of Babylon[45]). Here too the conqueror's throne is erected after the city is taken (Jer. 1:15; 43:9), a custom possibly deriving from the function of the *peṯaḥ ša'ar* as the place where publicly relevant legal proceedings are conducted in times of peace (Josh.

42. G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 418.

43. See L. Delekat, *BHHW*, III, 2009-10.

44. See H. Rösel, "Studien zur Topographie der Kriege in den Büchern Josua und Richter," *ZDPV* 92 (1976) 26 n. 90.

45. A different view is taken by Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27*, 18-19.

20:4; 1 K. 22:10; 2 K. 10:8; 2 Ch. 18:9; Jer. 26:10; probably also Josh. 8:29; Job 31:34).[46] It also seems to have been the place where speeches were given (Prov. 1:21; 8:3; 9:14). We also read that smaller shrines were located near a city *peṯaḥ* (2 K. 23:8) or that prostitutes sought customers there (Gen. 38:14; I. Robinson suggests that *peṯaḥ* also refers to Tamar's suggestive behavior[47]). The remaining occurrences of *peṯaḥ* in the sense of city gate (1 K. 17:10; Jer. 19:2) focus only on the gate as the setting for some event and to that extent say little about the actual function of a *peṯaḥ*. City gates are used figuratively in Isa. 3:26, where Jerusalem's gates as *pars pro toto* lament Zion's decimation; and in Prov. 8:34, Wisdom extols those who keep watch at her "gates."

The last passage also accords well with the context surrounding *peṯaḥ bêṯ*, since the entrances to houses must occasionally also be carefully guarded against intruders (Gen. 19:6,11) and function as the site of apotropaic rituals for protecting the household (Ex. 12:22,23). Entrances such as those to the royal residence require other, in this case military, measures (2 S. 11:9; 1 K. 14:27; 2 Ch. 12:10). If by contrast a young man is advised to keep his distance from a door to avoid being enticed by the woman of the house, the reference is then to a particularly crass form of moral degeneracy (Prov. 5:8), since the house entrance normally constitutes an inviolable boundary between the public sphere on the one hand and the intimate sphere of the individual or family on the other (Jgs. 19:26,27; Dt. 22:21; Job 31:9).[48] Conversations with strangers thus take place at the house entrance (Gen. 43:19; 2 K. 4:15[?]; 5:9; Ezk. 33:30; in Jgs. 4:20 a tent entrance). Nothing characterizes the hubristic immorality of the powerful as practiced by Jeroboam's wife more than the peripheral reference to her having entered Ahijah's house without being invited (1 K. 14:6). This function manifests itself in an architectonically refined form in Est. 5:1, which describes how the throne in the king's audience hall was situated exactly opposite the *peṯaḥ*, enabling the king to see petitioners standing in the court. Nu. 11:10 and 16:27 are similarly less concerned with dialogue than with other forms of acoustic communication, in this case with lament and commination, with the participants again standing at the tent entrances. Gen. 18:1ff. provides an especially revealing example of the communicative function of the *peṯaḥ*, though here the term's secular function shifts directly into a theological statement. Commensurate with nomadic custom, Abraham sits in the tent entrance while awaiting visitors with news; what he and Sarah then receive, however, is a revelation. The remaining passages offer little relevant information concerning the term's meaning (Gen. 6:16, the door of the ark; Prov. 17:19, the *māšāl* about the door that was built too high; Neh. 3:20,21, house entrances as points of demarcation during the wall construction).

Six passages do not quite fit these classifications. In 1 K. 19:13; Ps. 24:7,9; Hos. 2:17(15); Mic. 7:5, the genitive objects pose problems, whereas Gen. 4:7 has no such referent and instead uses *peṯaḥ* absolutely. Whereas the expression *piṯḥê-pîḵā* (Mic.

46. See L. Köhler, *Hebrew Man* (Eng. trans. 1956), 130ff.
47. I. Robinson, "*bĕpetaḥ ʿênayim* in Genesis 38:14," *JBL* 96 (1977) 569.
48. → סַף *sap*, X, 297-98.

7:5) can be identified as a (pleonastic) expression in the sense of earlier expressions using the root with *peh* (see above) and can be classified among the secular passages, Hos. 2:17(15); Gen. 4:7; 1 K. 19:13; Ps. 24:7,9 all represent significant examples of the specifically theological use of *peṯaḥ* and thus require special discussion.

When Hos. 2:17(15) calls the Valley of Achor a *peṯaḥ tiqwâ,* it refers less to a concrete gate or door than to a place where after a long period of misfortune the new dimension of a positive future emerges.[49] The use of *peṯaḥ* in Gen. 4:7 is generally explained with reference to the "door of the heart" in a kind of reciprocal analogy to Prov. 5:8. Just as the seductress lurks inside the door in Prov. 5:8, so also does sin lurk before the "door of the heart" waiting to get control of a person.[50] An extended interpretation, however, seems to do better justice to the passage, an interpretation taking seriously that *peṯaḥ* is used here in both an absolute and a determined sense and taking into consideration the passage's overall high degree of abstraction. The protasis ("if you do not do well") already presents a concrete negative action as the presupposition for what follows. A person need exert only minimal force against the boundaries set for human beings, or create even a tiny "opening" in this God-given protection, and nothing can stop the primal power of sin; the dam bursts, and sin has free access to the person. The reference is thus not to an opening in the sense of "door" that is present from the outset, but rather to an opening human behavior itself makes, a "breach" or boundary incursion from the inside giving sin access to a person.

In 1 K. 19:13 the singular expression "cave entrance" is less significant than the fact that this passage is the first to attest the "pattern" or conceptual model providing the backdrop for most of the passages using *peṯaḥ* theologically, namely, the divine encounter at a *peṯaḥ*. In an elementary sense, a person encounters a new dimension of reality at every *peṯaḥ* in that every conduit or passage (every entry or exit) through which a person passes from concealment into openness, from the social sphere into the private sphere, from one form of existence to another — every such passage implies the opening of a new perspective. The author of 1 K. 19 skillfully employs this notion of transition and openness by symbolically setting Elijah's encounter with God at such a place of transition. This place of transition from the concealment of the cave into the openness of the wilderness becomes the locus of revelation where Elijah himself is led from the narrow confines of his religious beliefs into the vast expanse of divine reality. Ps. 24:7,9 portray a similar situation, albeit with a reversal of "inside" and "outside" and with reference to a concrete sanctuary in which the *meleḵ hakkāḇôḏ* takes up residence and whose gates thus become the "gates to eternity."[51]

The term *peṯaḥ* thus seems redundant in theological texts focusing on the anticipated or past transformation of this notion into architectonic reality, specifically with regard to the previously mentioned distinction between "inside" and "outside." For ex-

---

49. See J. Jeremias, *Der Prophet Hosea. ATD* XXIV/1 (1983), 47-48.

50. A different view is taken by U. Wöller, "Zu Gen 4,7," *ZAW* 91 (1979) 436, who explicates "from the womb on"; also M. Ben Yashar, "Zu Gen 4,7," *ZAW* 94 (1982) 635-37, "for the firstborn."

51. See H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59* (Eng. trans. 1987), 315.

ample, the various temple doors leading to the *d^e^ḇîr* are decorated with varying degrees of splendor depending on their proximity to that locus of divine encounter (1 K. 6:31,33[6:8; 7:5]; no parallels in Chronicles if the cj. in *BHK* on 2 Ch. 4:22 is correct). This notion is combined with the secular function of gates in Jer. 36:10, where Baruch reads the words of Jeremiah from a scroll at the "entry of the New Gate" of the temple.

This notion predominates in unmistakably postexilic texts such as Ezekiel, where one notes a tendency to use the term in a consciously atypical fashion. Ezk. 8–11 mentions several different openings, including a certain conceptual heightening in Ezk. 8: Jerusalem's north gate (v. 3), the entrance to the forecourt (v. 7), a hole in the wall of the forecourt (v. 8), the passageway at the temple's north gate (v. 14), the entrance to the *hêḵāl* (v. 16), and the passageway at the temple's east gate (10:19; 11:1). At each of these portals, negative circumstances are "revealed" that prompt the *k^e^ḇôḏ yhwh* to depart through the east gate. In the portrayal of the future city of God and its temple, the various "openings" become places at which to various degrees the divine reality is revealed or becomes accessible to human beings (23 times in Ezk. 40–47). The last (and most important?) of these occurrences involves the miraculous river flowing out from the temple, providing a bridge to Ps. 105:41 and to the other occurrences of the verb in this context.

This word occurs with striking frequency in the texts involving the Sinai sanctuary; as a result, the concept itself tends to dominate these texts[52] as well as the Priestly texts as a whole in Exodus and Numbers (also Dt. 31:15), where *peṯaḥ* is used stereotypically especially in connection with the *'ōhel mô'ēḏ* or the *miškān* (42 times explicitly with *'ōhel mô'ēḏ*, also 3 times outside the Sinaitic texts in the extremely late passages Josh. 19:51; 1 S. 2:22; 1 Ch. 9:21[53]; 7 times implicitly [only *hā'ōhel*], 3 times with *miškān*, and twice in the redundant expression *peṯaḥ miškan 'ōhel mô'ēḏ*, which probably derives from the secondary imposition of an *'ōhel mô'ēḏ* conception onto an "ark-dwelling" conception[54]). The "opening" of the *'ōhel mô'ēḏ* is clearly not meant merely in the visible spatial sense of "tent entrance." It is the place where the pillar of cloud *('ammûḏ he'ānān)* descends as the earthly representative of Yahweh's presence; in that sense it is the gate through which the divine enters the Israelites' world, the place at which the divine mystery is "opened up" to Moses, the point of contact between the heavenly and earthly spheres (cf. Gen. 28:17, albeit with *ša'ar*).

Such passages apply the secular use of *peṯaḥ* to theological contexts with no morphological changes, rendering clearly superfluous the Masoretic assumption of an independent lexeme *pēṯaḥ* alongside *peṯaḥ* as a technical term for the revelation of the divine word (Ps. 119:130).[55] Nor is this interpretation of the (expanded) expression obviated by the rather promiscuous use of *peṯaḥ* and *'ōhel* in precisely this textual

---

52. Concerning the identification of the various strata in this textual complex, see H. Utzschneider, *Das Heiligtum und das Gesetz: Studien zur Bedeutung der sinaitischen Heiligtumstexte (Ex 25–40; Lev 8–9)*. *OBO* 77 (1988); for an analysis of the relevant terms, see esp. 124ff.

53. See V. Fritz, *Tempel und Zelt*. *WMANT* 47 (1977), 107-8.

54. See Utzschneider, *Heiligtum*, 125, 252, *et passim*.

55. See A. Deissler, *Psalm 119(118) und seine Theologie*. *MTS* I/11 (1955), 227-28.

complex, in this instance Ex. 33:8-10, with both theological and secular reference (twice each).[56] Rather, the latter passage consciously emphasizes once again the special nature of the *'ōhel mô'ēḏ* over against the Israelites' normal tents. Just as the tent entrance is the locus of encounter with the "other" (in the sense of other persons), so also is the entrance to the *'ōhel mô'ēḏ* the locus of encounter with the "Wholly Other"; this notion repeats the theological conceptual figure of Gen. 18:1ff. at a higher level of abstraction.

III. 1. *LXX.* The LXX generally translates *ptḥ* as *anoígein* or *dianoígein.* Commensurate with the broad use of this root in extremely varied contexts, however, nineteen other Greek equivalents are also used, among which *lýein* (for the qal, niphal, and piel) is the most frequent. Other renderings used more than once include *diarrḗssein* (for the qal and piel), *spán* (for the qal), and *glýphein* (for the piel/pual [II]); other translations are used only once each. Among the latter, *orýssein* in Zech. 3:9 deserves special mention given the interpretation of the passage suggested above. The LXX clearly prefers to render *peṯaḥ* with *thýra* over the occasional *pýlē, pylṓn,* or *próthyron, thýrōma; mapṯēaḥ* is rendered as *kleís, pittûaḥ* as *glyphḗ* and five other equivalents. The other ten words or word combinations with which the LXX translates noun derivatives are contextually specific and accordingly occur but once each.

2. *Sirach, Qumran, Later Judaism.* This root occurs 8 times in Sirach (34[31]:7 is probably to be read *pôṯeh*), including 5 times (6?) as a verb. Although the relative frequency of the noun and verb does not coincide completely with the OT distribution discussed above, no other peculiarities emerge. The same OT meaning is attested by the singular occurrences of *pittûaḥ* (45:11), *mapṯēaḥ* (42:6 M; B has *tiptaḥ*), and *peṯaḥ* in the figurative or metaphorical sense, including in connection with the appropriate use of wisdom (14:23). The same idea is expressed with the verb in 51:19. The expression "I opened my mouth" is used as a stylistically elevated substitution for "I spoke" in 51:25 (cf. Ps. 78:2; Prov. 31:26), while in Sir. 15:5 it is the hypostasis Wisdom who opens the mouth of her disciple (cf. Ps. 51:17[15]). The only passage not corresponding to OT usage is the warning in Sir. 34(31):12 against gaping (opening one's mouth too widely) at the "table of the great." Finally, 4:31 (A) uses the expression "open one's hand," as do Dt. 15:8,11.

The root is used in an analogous fashion in the Qumran texts as well, where the clear dominance of verbal passages may be simply fortuitous. Among the 46 occurrences of the root adduced in Kuhn, the noun *peṯaḥ* occurs but once. The verb predominates even in texts published since Kuhn. Noun derivatives occur 19 times, including *peṯaḥ* 17 times and *pittûaḥ* twice (4Q405 fr. 23 II:1,7),[57] whereas the verb occurs 28 times if the 6 occurrences in textual fragments classified among the latter group do in-

56. Concerning the literary relationship between all the *'ōhel-mô'ēḏ* texts, see Utzschneider, *Heiligtum,* 249 n. 1; a different view is taken by R. Schmitt, *Zelt und Lade als Thema alttestamentlicher Wissenschaft* (Gütersloh, 1972), 212ff.

57. See C. Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice. HSS* 27 (1985), 332-36.

deed represent verbal forms (1Q25 4:3; 3Q14 1:1; 4Q487 16:2; 4Q499 1:5; 4Q511 156:2; 5Q15 fr. 1 II:14; occurrences listed in Kuhn that belong in this context include 1QH 8:16; 18:32; 1QH fr. 64:2). The absence of passages using *peṯaḥ* in the theological sense discussed above is already suggested by these statistical findings and may reflect the familiar inclination of the Qumran community to distance itself from the Jerusalem temple as the locus of divine encounter. For even 4Q405 fr. 23 I:8,9 or 11QShirShabb 2-1-9, 6, which refer (in an allusion to Ps. 24:7,9?) to the entry portals of God's heavenly palace, can at best be adduced only indirectly as witnesses for related concepts, since the reference is not really to a place of direct contact between God and human beings, or to a place of earthly revelation by God himself, but only to the entry and exit used by heavenly mediators on their way from the heavenly king to human beings and back.[58] Although 5Q15 fr. 1 II:2 uses the term (verb) once in portraying the new Jerusalem in a fashion possibly influenced by Ezk. 40ff., the isolated, singular status of the passage militates against adducing it to support any genuinely far-reaching conclusions.

The remaining occurrences of *peṯaḥ* correspond largely to OT usage and generally refer to openings, entries, or passageways in buildings or other objects created by human efforts (11QT 31:7; 41:14; 42:2; 46:6; 3Q15 1:8,11; 6:2,3,6; 10:10). Even in 11QT, which like Ezk. 40ff. is interested in the ideal sanctuary, *peṯaḥ* occurs only 4 times, and then only in unimportant contexts, confirming the previous suspicion that the Qumran community was disinclined to embrace the theological concept associated with the term in Exodus, Numbers, and Ezekiel. Although it is worth noting that 1QM 11:9 picks up the unusual expression from Hos. 2:17(15), the context in 1QM remains somewhat obscure. By contrast, 4Q184 1:10 speaks in an unmistakably secular fashion about the entrance to a brothel, clearly evoking the conceptual associations discussed in connection with Gen. 38:14.[59] Finally, 11QPs[a] 18:5,10 use *peṯaḥ* in a more figurative or metaphorical sense in reference to the gates of wisdom or the gates of the righteous where wisdom is heard.

A related notion, albeit expressed by the verb, can probably also be assumed for 11QPs[a] 21:17 to the extent that the textual corruption can be illuminated by Sir. 51:19; here the disciple of Wisdom opens her gates to gain immediate access to her. The remaining occurrences of the verb in Qumran involve the same variety of objects mentioned in the OT and even, albeit to a lesser degree, the same frequency of objects from building construction and body parts; the technical meaning "engrave, bore through" occurs 3 times (1QM 5:7; 4Q405 frs. 14-15 I:2,5).

As already suggested, the general tendency is to expand the term into a more metaphorical and abstract meaning. Alongside "natural" gates (11QT 31:6; 1QM 12:13), cities (11QT 62:7; cf. Dt. 20:11), fortresses (1QH 6:30), and galleries (3Q15 12, 10), such texts also mention the opening of the "gates of war" (1QM 3:1,7; 16:4; 4Q493 1:2), the "gates of salvation" (1QM 18:7), the "gates of the underworld" (1QH 3:17; in

58. See ibid., 322ff., 372ff.

59. See I.4 above.

3:16 without "gate"), and the "lures of wickedness" (1QH 3:26). Similarly, references are made in all three nuances not only to opening one's mouth (1QS 10:23; 1QM 14:6; 1QH 10:7; 12:33; CD 5:12; 4Q491 [4QM[a]] fr. 11 I:17; 511 10:9; 511 75:2), but also to opening one's tongue/language (1QH 5:26; 4Q381 45:5), not only to opening one's eyes (4QEn[e] [4Q206] fr. 4 III:17), but also to opening one's heart (1QH 10:31; 1QH fr. 4:12); indeed, God even opens "wide" a person's heart (1QH 5:33). 1QH 10:7 and 4Q511 75:2 are especially important in this context in that they carry forward the theological use of this expression already specifically shaped in Ezk. 3:27 and generalized in Ps. 51:17(15).

Physical objects used in expressions with *pṯḥ* include the familiar OT objects such as "book" (of the law; CD 5:3) and "vessel" (CD 11:9; 11QT 49:9; cf. Nu. 19:15). Expressions not found in the OT include opening (i.e., loosening the locking mechanism of) the "wheels" used in slaughtering within the ideal sanctuary (11QT 34:8),[60] opening the inner chambers of the earth (4QEn[e] fr. 4 I:17; but cf. also Isa. 24:18; Mal. 3:10) and springs (1QH 8:21; but cf. also Ex. 21:33 and the passages just cited).

Several references are made to figurative or metaphorical "opening." Objects include a way or path (1QH fr. 3:2), roots that "open" (in the sense of "stretching out") toward living water (1QH 8:7; cf. Job 29:19), though God can also "open" springs or fountains. Depending on the situation of the petitioner, the last can include a "fountain of knowledge" (1QH 2:18; indirectly also 18:10,12), a "fountain of bitter mourning" (11:19), or even the "eternal fountain" of heaven (1QSb 1:4). As in the OT itself, God is viewed as the ultimate savior or deliverer (4Q511 42:8), as the only one who can both seal shut and open up again (4Q511 30:3; cf. Job 12:14). Given this universal-abstract use of expressions with God as the subject of *pṯḥ,* it is easy to understand how the most varied situations can be interpreted in the broader sense as "deliverance." The Qumran authors accordingly use *pṯḥ* not only to describe how God opens the storehouse of darkness (1QS 10:2) and allows light to shine forth (11:3), but also to describe how he "unleashes distress" (11:13; 1QH 15:16; even the emergence ["opening up"] of distress is expressed with *pṯḥ* [so in 1QS 10:17]) or delivers a person from pain (1QH 11:32); indeed, he reveals knowledge (1QS 11:15; 1QH 12:13), his word (1QH 18:20), his righteousness (4Q511 frs. 63-64 III:1), and "his holy sabbaths and his glorious feasts, the testimonies of his righteousness and the ways of his truth, and the desires of his will" (CD 3:14-16). It is thus not surprising when 4QTLevi[a] ar (213) 2:16,17 and 4QEn[c] fr. 1 XIII:23 describe revelations during the primal age with the same topoi as those found in Ezk. 1:1. 4QFlor (174) 5:3 shows that alongside these OT ideas the Qumranites also entertained dualistic views. For the first and only time, the antidivine figure of Belial appears as the subject of opening when he "opens up" (causes) bad things for the house of Judah.

The few occurrences of *pṯḥ* in secular contexts from this period offer little new information. Naḥal Ḥever Contract B refers to construction "passages," and grave texts

---

60. For a more detailed discussion, see J. Maier, *The Temple Scroll: An Intro., Trans., and Comm. JSOTSup* 34 (Eng. trans. 1985), 34, 89.

prohibit the opening of tombs.[61] Both references easily fit the picture offered by the literary texts.

Finally, later Judaism uses the root in a theological sense as a technical term in connection with scriptural exegesis,[62] asserting that the time of direct revelation is over; from now on the "opening up" of divine secrets can occur only by way of scriptural exegesis.

Bartelmus

---

61. See J. A. Fitzmyer and D. J. Harrington, *A Manual of Palestinian Aramaic Texts. BietOr* 34 (1978), nos. 51.4; 67.4; 70.4; 71.2-3; 95.6).

62. See M. Gertner, "Terms of Scriptural Interpretation: A Study of Hebrew Semantics," *BSOAS* 25 (1962) 1-27.

פָּתַל *pāṯal;* נַפְתּוּלִים *naptûlîm;* פְּתַלְתֹּל *pᵉṯaltōl;* פָּתִיל *pāṯîl*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology; 2. LXX and Vulgate. II. Occurrences. III. Meaning: 1. Prov. 8:8; Job 5:13; Ps. 18:27(Eng. 26) par. 2 S. 22:27; Dt. 32:5 (adj.); 2. Gen. 30:8. IV. *pāṯîl* and *naptālî.*

I. 1. *Etymology.* The root *ptl* occurs in Middle Hebrew (with the meaning "twist, ruin; wrap"), Qumran (1QS 10:24, niphal ptcp. *nptlwt,* "twistedness, crookedness"), Aramaic ("twist, ruin"), Akkadian (*patālu,* "turn, wrap"),[1] also Syriac, Mandaic,[2] Ethiopic, Tigriña,[3], and Arabic (*fatala,* "twist/turn together, weave, thread").[4] The term *pāṯîl,* "thread, cord," has a whole series of parallel Semitic terms;[5] cf. esp. Mand. *ptula* II, "thread," and *ptiliata,* "wick";[6] and Arab. *fatla,* "twisting together, weaving; thread," *fatil* (adj.), "twisted, woven, wound," subst. "wick," also *fatila;*[7] and Akk. *pitiltu.*

2. *LXX and Vulgate.* The LXX translates with *strangaliṓdēs* (Prov. 8:8), *polýplokos* (Job 5:13), and forms of *strebloún* and *diastréphein* (Ps. 18:27[26] par. 2 S. 22:27; Dt. 32:5). The Vulg. uses forms of *perversus, perverto* (Prov. 8:8; Dt. 32:5; Ps. 18:27[26]), and *pravus* (Job 5:13).

---

1. *AHw,* II, 847.
2. *MdD,* 385.
3. *WbTigr,* 664.
4. Wehr, 695.
5. See *HAL,* III, 990.
6. *MdD,* 384.
7. Wehr, 695.

II. Occurrences. The verb *ptl* occurs 5 times, 3 times in the niphal (Gen. 30:8; Prov. 8:8; Job 5:13) and twice in the hithpael (Ps. 18:27[26] and then abbreviated or corrupted in the par. passage 2 S. 22:27). The subst. *naptûlê* is a hapax legomenon occurring as the internal object of the verb form (cognate acc.) in Gen. 30:8, a passage also explaining the etiology of the name Naphtali. The adj. *pᵉṯaltōl* also occurs but once (Dt. 32:5). The word *pāṯîl,* "cord, thread," is related to the root *ptl* and occurs 12 times (including Sir. 6:30).

III. Meaning.

1. *Prov. 8:8; Job 5:13; Ps. 18:27(Eng. 26) par. 2 S. 22:27; Dt. 32:5 (adj.).* If we discount the difficult passage Gen. 30:8 for the moment, this word otherwise exhibits a fairly consistent content and meaning (i.e., for the verbal forms in Prov. 8:8; Job 5:13; Ps. 18:27[26] par. 2 S. 22:27; and the adj. in Dt. 32:5). Against the background of the root meaning "twist, turn," these words all exhibit a negative metaphorical meaning in the sense of "twisted." Moreover, they all occur in verse and some in fixed expressions.

The niphal forms in Prov. 8:8 and Job 5:13 are participles; Prov. 8:8 uses the masc. sg. in reference to the characteristics or content of words, and Job 5:13 the masc. pl. in reference to persons. In Prov. 8:8, "all the words of my mouth are righteous; there is nothing twisted or crooked in them," *niptāl* and *'iqqēš* together constitute a semantic pair (the structure of vv. 7-9 confirms the close proximity of the two terms). The expression *niptāl wᵉʻiqqēš* refers to the content that prevents the discourse itself from being true and righteous (v. 8a). In v. 9 the words *nāḵōaḥ* and *yāšār* (also v. 6) provide antitheses ("straight, right"), while in v. 7 the more general term *'ᵉmeṯ* is paralleled by *rešaʻ* ("wickedness").

Job 5:13 characterizes the *niptālîm* as "crafty" and "wise" with the parallel terms *'ᵃrûmîm* ("clever" in the sense of "crafty," v. 12) and *ḥᵃḵāmîm* (whose behavior is also described with the term *'rm,* v. 13 [cf. v. 12]). Eliphaz believes that self-confident human craftiness fails to reckon with God's actions, and as a result their own actions come to nought. Their schemes and counsel stumble with excessive hastiness. "They grope about in life as in the dark while in the light of their craftiness they believe they can step out securely" (v. 14).[8] God's reaction to them (v. 13a, "he takes the wise in their own craftiness") recalls Ps. 18:27(26). In this context the "twisted" in Job 5:13 are viewed as the "crafty, deceitful, shifty, or wicked."

In Ps. 18:27(26) the hithpael ("show oneself to be twisted, perverse with someone") is construed with *'im,* like the niphal in Gen. 30:8. Here *ptl* occurs in a series of several verb forms each of which is juxtaposed with an adjective derived from the same stem, and in this case *ptl* itself corresponds to the adj. *'iqqēš.* The assertion is that God will deal accordingly with the "crooked, false." The following verse provides an example in which God humbles "haughty eyes." Antithetical terms to *titpattāl* here include (all hithpael) *ḥsd, tmm,* and *brr* (accepting the cj. of *HAL;* vv. 26-27[25-26]). The parallel passage 2 S. 22:27 has *tittappāl* instead of *titpattāl,* i.e., either an abbreviated or a corrupt form.[9]

---

8. G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 151.

9. According to J. Blau, "Über die t-Form des hifʻil im Bibelhebräisch," *VT* 7 (1957) 387 n. 1, this form represented a rhymed construction.

The meaning of the adj. *pᵉṯaltōl,* "twisted, perverse" (Dt. 32:5), corresponds to that of the previously mentioned verb forms. Here *pᵉṯaltōl* constitutes a semantic pair with *ʿiqqēš* just as did *nipṯāl* in Prov. 8:8, but now characterizing an entire people instead of merely individual "wicked, perverse" people as in Job 5:13. These people are then addressed in Dt. 32:6 as *ʿam nāḇāl wᵉlōʾ ḥāḵām* after v. 4 focused on God as their antithesis with corresponding terminology *(ʾên ʿāwel, ṣaddîq wᵉyāšār).* The parallel and antithetical terms circumscribe a rich and yet simultaneously quite general meaning in the sense of "twisted, perverse, wicked."

Even though *ptl* does exhibit a close semantic relationship with *ʿiqqēš* (Dt. 32:5; Ps. 18:27[26]; Prov. 8:8) and is used similarly (verse, typical antithesis), it occurs too infrequently in the larger sense to say whether it was used as a specific term in this sense and represents a late construction (the niphal ptcp. and perhaps also the adj. might rather represent fixed terms).

2. *Gen. 30:8.* Not only is the expression *napṯûlê ʾᵉlōhîm nipṯaltî* in Gen. 30:8 unique as such, the noun and verb (as finite niphal forms) are as well. The same applies to its generally accepted translation as "with wrestlings I have wrestled," a translation drawing etymologically from the basic meaning "twisting, turning, weaving," and the attendant image of "becoming intertwined (as in wrestling)," whence the meaning "to wrestle, battle." Moreover, the context of "doing battle" in this sense is rendered certain by the following *gam yāḵōltî.*[10]

These "wrestlings with God" have been subject to extremely varied interpretations, especially since some connection must also be established with the following "with my sister." Scholars have interpreted the *napṯûlê ʾᵉlōhîm* as "struggles of prayer in the face of temptations of faith" ("fought with Leah, though basically with God himself," so F. Delitzsch), as a "struggle for God's grace and blessing" ("with Leah"; A. Dillmann) or similarly as a "struggle for offspring, for divine blessing" (H. Gunkel, who deletes "with my sister," since Rachel allegedly could not have defeated Leah with only two sons; she "fought with God and wrested from him the sons denied her to this point"[11]), as "struggles whose outcome God's own judgment decides" (O. Procksch,[12] also earlier E. W. Hengstenberg, and recently E. A. Speiser, who adduces the fact that *ʾᵉlōhîm* also appears "as the instrument of divination by ordeal" in understanding the sentence as "a metaphorical allusion to an ordeal," and then paraphrases, "I have been entangled in a contest with my sister, which only celestial powers could resolve, and I have emerged victorious from the ordeal"[13]). Or one can follow D. Winton Thomas in understanding *ʾᵉlōhîm* as an adjective ("mighty, fearful"),[14] in which case "it is obvious

---

10. See C. Westermann, *Genesis 12–36* (Eng. trans. 1985), 474.

11. A. Dillmann, *Genesis,* 2 vols. (Eng. trans. 1897), II, 241; H. Gunkel, *Genesis* (Eng. trans. 1997), 325.

12. O. Procksch, *Die Genesis. KAT* I (^{3}1924), 348.

13. E. A. Speiser, *Genesis. AB* 1 (1964), 230-31.

14. D. Winton Thomas, "A Consideration of Some Unusual Ways of Expressing the Superlative in Hebrew," *VT* 3 (1953) 209ff.

that a struggle with her sister is meant."[15] Delitzsch had already suggested this interpretation as an alternative ("superhuman struggles"), understanding *'ᵉlōhîm* as the general subject.[16] A. B. Ehrlich lists this alternative exclusively, but rejects especially the translation "struggle, battle" for *naptûlê,* suggesting rather "wily trick," and for the verb "resort to a wily trick."[17]

If one chooses not to adduce a special meaning for Gen. 30:8, then the consistent meaning exhibited by the other passages must provide illumination. One way is to understand the present story (v. 8 probably belonged originally to an independent episode[18]) from the perspective of one of its most important compositional elements: the women's struggle for the status of favorite. After Rachel has enjoyed this advantage from the outset, Leah can only hope after the birth of each of her first sons that Jacob will turn to her (29:32ff.). Whether Rachel is in danger of losing her position or has already lost it, she needs children and thus offers Jacob her maid. If Rachel's own etiology is also applied to the struggle for her position, then *dānannî* ("God has judged me right," v. 6) means that God has justified her position through the birth of "her" son Dan. This is also the sense in which *yāḵōltî* in v. 8 is to be understood: "I was successful, I have prevailed." With *niptaltî,* Rachel would be confirming that she drove her sister back and cheated her. In any event, in 30:15 Leah accuses Rachel of having stolen her (Leah's) husband. The connotation of the term *niptaltî* does not seem to be as negative as was the case in Proverbs and Job, and the internal obj. *naptûlê 'ᵉlōhîm* not only refers to the one who provides the child, but also justifies Rachel's own actions. Although an adjectival understanding of *'ᵉlōhîm* is possible even here, two factors militate against such an understanding. First, the reference to God in the naming of the child is an essential element; second, it prevents Rachel's behavior from being merely arbitrary. Finding an appropriate translation remains difficult, however, since *naptûlê 'ᵉlōhîm* can only be rendered rather freely to the effect: "with God's help I acted crookedly toward my sister and was successful" (a translation closely paralleling the LXX).

IV. *pāṯîl* and *naptālî*. The noun *pāṯîl* everywhere means "cord, thread" (unless one understands Nu. 19:15 adjectivally; cf. *HAL*) and is then specified more closely by a *nomen rectum* as a "string of tow" (Jgs. 16:9), a "line of flax" (Ezk. 40:3), a "blue string" (Ex. 28:28,37; 39:21,31; Nu. 15:38; Sir. 6:30); or it refers to a thread cut out of hammered gold leaf (Ex. 39:3), or to a cord from which a signet ring hangs (Gen. 38:18,25). The name Naphtali probably derives from a place-name (Josh. 20:7; Jgs. 4:6).[19]

Warmuth

---

15. Westermann, *Genesis 12–36,* 474.
16. F. Delitzsch, *New Comm. on Genesis,* 2 vols. (Eng. trans. 1899), II, 175.
17. A. B. Ehrlich, *Randglossen zur Hebräischen Bibel* (1908; repr. Leipzig, 1968), I, 145-46.
18. Westermann, *Genesis 12–36,* 474-75.
19. Concerning its interpretation as "hill dweller," see J. Lewy, "The Old West Semitic Sun God Ḥammu," *HUCA* 18 (1944) 452 n. 122; *HAL,* III, 990.

פֶּתֶן *peṯen* → נחשׁ *nāḥāš*

פתר *ptr* → פֵּשֶׁר *pešer*

צֹאָה *ṣō'â;* צֵאָה *ṣē'â;* צֹאִי *ṣō'î*

Contents: I. Occurrences in Extrabiblical Semitic Languages. II. 1. Etymology; 2. OT Occurrences. III. OT Use: 1. Normal Secular Usage; 2. In Prophetic Proclamation: a. Literal Sense; b. Metaphorical Sense. IV. 1. Qumran; 2. LXX.

I. Occurrences in Extrabiblical Semitic Languages. The Heb. *ṣō'â/ṣē'â* is probably related to Akk. *zû* I, "dung, excrement, filth."[1] The Ugar. *zâ* developed a specialized meaning emphasizing the intense olfactory element or vapor in the positive sense of "fragrance"[2] (cf. also Eth. *ṣē'a,* "to stink"). The root is not attested in Old Aramaic. Jewish Aramaic attests the verb *ṣ*ᵉ*'ā',* "be dirty, ugly," and the subst. *ṣā'ṯā',* "ugliness," figuratively "sinfulness."[3] One might also compare Syr. *ṣ*ᵉ*'î,* "be dirty."

II. 1. *Etymology.* Both Gesenius and Kopf derive *ṣō'â* from the root → יצא *yāṣā'.*[4] As an alternative, *HAL* mentions the root **ṣw'* or Arab. *waṣi'a,* "be dirty," and compares Aram. *ṣ*ᵉ*'â* (see above).[5]

2. *OT Occurrences.* The subst. *ṣō'â (ṣē'â)/ṣō'î* occurs 9 times in the OT.[6] The adj. *ṣō'î* is used in only a single textual complex (twice). The pointing of the noun fluctuates between *ṣō'â* (5 times) and *ṣē'â* (twice); the short form *ṣē'* has been posited for Isa. 30:22.

III. OT Use.

1. *Normal Secular Usage.* In Dt. 23:14(Eng. 13) the noun *ṣō'â/ṣē'â* refers to the excrement a soldier is to bury outside the camp. 2 K. 18:27 par. Isa. 36:12 describes the mate-

---

ṣō'â. G. R. Driver, "Hebrew Notes," *ZAW* 52 (1934) 51-56; L. Kopf, "Arabische Etymologien und Parallelen zum Bibelwörterbuch," *VT* 8 (1958) 161-215, esp. 177-78.

1. *AHw,* III, 1535.
2. *WUS,* no. 2366.
3. *WTM,* IV, 161ff.
4. *GesTh,* II, 616 (cf. III, 1153); Kopf, 177.
5. *HAL,* III, 992.
6. *HAL,* II, 992, adds 3 additional occurrences as cjs.; see III.2.a below.

rial distress of the city of Jerusalem under siege, when the inhabitants will be forced "to eat their own dung and to drink their own urine" (*Q ṣōʾâ* and *mêmê raglayim* replace the probably offensive expressions *ḥarʾêhem* and *šênêhem* from *K;* in this context cf. Ezk. 4:12). Isa. 28:8 describes the indulgent life of the priests and prophets in Jerusalem with the words, "All tables are covered with filthy vomit; no place is without dung."

2. *In Prophetic Proclamation.* a. *Literal Sense.* In the prophetic proclamation of chastisement, "dung" is used to described the coming disaster. In announcing the imminent calamity at the commencement of the siege of Jerusalem, Ezekiel performs a symbolic act: "You shall eat the bread [made of all sorts of grains and fruits] as a barley-cake, baking it in their sight on human dung" (Ezk. 4:12).

In the following passages, *ṣēʾâ/ṣōʾâ* has been suggested as a conjecture. Isa. 30:22: "Then you will defile your silver-covered idols and your gold-plated images. You will scatter them like filthy rags; you will say to them, 'dung!'" *(ṣēʾ tōʾmar lô);* here *ṣēʾ (ṣōʾ)* is understood as a secondary form of *ṣēʾâ/ṣōʾâ.*[7] W. Rudolph suggests reading *ṣōʾâ* in Jer. 48:18 instead of the inappropriate *ṣāmāʾ:* "Come down from your glory, and sit in the filth, inhabitants of Dibon!"[8] Scholars since Hitzig have followed the LXX and Syr. in replacing the hapax legomenon *ṣāpâ,* "flowing" (of blood? from *ṣwp,* "flow"[9]), in Ezk. 32:6 with *ṣōʾâ,*[10] though even this solution is unsatisfactory.

b. *Metaphorical Sense.* The noun and adj. *ṣōʾâ/ṣēʾâ/ṣōʾî* refer in the metaphorical sense to ethical-moral or cultic transgressions. Isa. 4:4 portrays a future in which a purifying judgment precedes the epiphany (vv. 5-6): "once the Lord has washed away the filth of the daughters of Zion and cleansed the bloodstains of Jerusalem from its midst by a spirit of judgment and by a spirit of burning." After the rebuilding of the temple, Joshua is selected as high priest and according to Zechariah's fourth night vision (Zech. 3:1-7) must be cleansed from his sins, an act symbolized by his change of clothes (vv. 3-4). Prov. 30:12 is to be understood similarly: "There are those who are pure in their own eyes yet are not cleansed of their filthiness," with vv. 11,14 specifying what is meant by *ṣōʾâ.*

IV. 1. *Qumran.* The Qumran writings attest both the noun and the adj. *ṣōʾâ/ṣōʾî.* 11QT 46:15 stipulates, probably following Dt. 23:14(13), that the latrines for the inhabitants of the holy city are to be located three thousand cubits from the city itself.[11]

---

7. H. Wildberger, *Jesaja. BK* X/3 (1982), 1191; cf. in this regard Driver, 53; the Talmud tractate *ʿAbod. Zar.* III.43ᵃ understands this passage similarly: "Despise the idol as filth" (*WTM,* IV, 162); both G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Jesaja. ZBK* 19 (1960), and O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 13–39. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1974), construe *ṣēʾ* as the impv. of *yṣʾ.*

8. W. Rudolph, *Jeremia. HAT* I/12 (³1968), 276.

9. See W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1983), 155; *HAL,* III, 1045b.

10. Cf. G. Fohrer, *Ezechiel. HAT* I/13 (²1955), 177; J. Gray, *The Legacy of Canaan. SVT* 5 (²1965), 281-82; *HAL,* III, 992.

11. Concerning the disputed location of this *bêṯ ṣōʾâ* (Josephus, *B.J.* 5.4.2 §145), cf. Y. Yadin, *Jerusalem Revealed* (Eng. trans. 1975), 90-91, who locates it northwest of the citadel; B. Pixner, *Studia Hierosolymitana,* I (Jerusalem, 1976), 256-57, who locates it southwest of Zion; also R. Riesner, "Essener und Urkirche in Jerusalem," *BiKi* 40 (1985) 64-76.

The Damascus Document uses the adj. *ṣōʾî* in the literal sense, asserting that "no man shall bathe in dirty water or in an amount too shallow to cover a man" (CD 10:11), and no man shall wear unwashed (soiled, or stored in a room) garments (CD 11:3).

2. *LXX.* The LXX translates the literal meaning of *ṣōʾâ/ṣēʾâ* as *kópros* (2 K. 18:27 par. Isa. 36:12; Ezk. 4:12), and the metaphorical meaning as *rhýpos/rhyparós* (Isa. 4:4; Zech. 3:3-4). It alters slightly the statement in Dt. 23:14(13) by using *aschēmosýnē,* and translates *ṣōʾâ* in Prov. 30:12 as *éxodos,* recalling the etymological problems discussed in II.1 above.

Beyse

צאן *ṣō'n*

Contents: I. 1. Semitic Dialects and Etymology; 2. OT Occurrences; 3. Meaning; 4. LXX. II. 1. Domesticated and Flock Animals; 2. As Possessions; 3. In Comparisons; 4. Topography. III. 1. Place of Calling; 2. As a Metaphor for the People and Community; 3. As a Sacrifice. IV. Qumran.

I. 1. *Semitic Dialects and Etymology.* This noun is found in all the Semitic languages. The Akk. *ṣēnu* is once glossed by Can. *ṣú-ú-nu.*[1] The term *ṣ'n (*ṣa'nu > *ṣānu > *ṣōnu),*[2] retaining the ', is attested in Hebrew and Samaritan *(ṣēʾōn)*[3] as well as in Phoenician, Moabite, and Ugaritic,[4] corresponding (with an elision of the ') to Sam. *ʿan,* Syr. *ʿānāʾ,* Palm. *ʿn,*[5] and Jewish Aram. *ʿān* or *ʿānāʾ.*[6] 1QapGen 22:2 attests Aram. *ʿnh,* and CTLevi 24:23 attests *ʿnʾ.*[7]

ṣō'n. F. S. Bodenheimer, *Animal Life in Palestine* (Jerusalem, 1935), 122-25; G. J. Botterweck, "Hirt und Herde im AT und im Alten Orient," *FS J. Kardinal Frings* (Cologne, 1960), 339-52; B. Brentjes, *Die Haustierwerdung im Orient. Neue Brehm-Bücherei* 344 (1965), 22-32; J. Clutton-Brock, "The Early History of Domesticated Animals in Western Asia," *Sumer* 36 (1980) 37-41; G. Dalman, *AuS,* VI, 180-203 and indices; L. Dürr, *Ursprung und Ausbau der israelitisch-jüdischen Heilandserwartung* (1925), 116-24; V. Hamp, "Das Hirtenmotiv im AT," *FS M. Kardinal Faulhaber* (Munich, 1949), 7-20; J. Jeremias, "ποιμήν κτλ.," *TDNT,* VI, 485-502; R. Rendtorff, *Studien zur Geschichte des Opfers im Alten Israel. WMANT* 24 (1967); I. Seibert, *Hirt, Herde, König: Zur Herausbildung des Königtums in Mesopotamien* (Berlin, 1969).

1. *AHw,* III, 1090-91; glossed in EA 263:12.
2. Meyer, §22.3a.
3. *HAL,* III, 992b.
4. Phoenician: *KAI* 26A.III.9; Moabite: *KAI* 181.31; *DNSI,* II, 954; Ugaritic: *UT,* no. 2137; *WUS,* no. 2297.
5. *DNSI,* II, 954.
6. Beyer, 661.
7. Ibid., 182, 195.

One possible comparable term is *ṣōneh* in Ps. 8:8(Eng. 7), a form generally explained as an orthographic variant of *ṣō'n* (some mss. attest *ṣ'nh*) with a fem. ending *ē*[8] or the archaic ending -**ay* > *ē*.[9] The term *ṣōna'ᵃḵem* in Nu. 32:24 probably represents a scribal error from *ṣō'nᵉḵem* (many mss. and Sam.) rather than a secondary form of *ṣn'*.

Other forms include Egyp. Aram. *qn*,[10] Mand. *aqna*, OSA *ḏ'n*, and Arab. *ḍa'nu*.[11] The word's etymology is obscure. Rather than deriving from the root *yṣ'* ("as does *próbaton* from *probaínein*"[12]), this term probably represents a primary noun.[13]

2. *OT Occurrences*. Including Ps. 8:8(7) and Nu. 32:24, *ṣō'n* occurs 275 times in the OT, distributed as follows: 63 times in Genesis; 29 in Ezekiel; 19 in 1 Samuel; 18 in Jeremiah; 17 each in Deuteronomy and the Psalms; 15 in Exodus; 13 each in Numbers and 2 Chronicles; 9 each in Leviticus and Zechariah; 8 in Isaiah; 7 each in 1 Kings and 1 Chronicles; 5 each in 2 Samuel, Job, and Nehemiah; 3 in Micah; twice in Amos; and once each in Joshua, 2 Kings, Hosea, Joel, Jonah, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Proverbs, Canticles, Ecclesiastes, and Ezra.

Among these occurrences, a certain concentration can be discerned in narratives set in the seminomadic milieu (Genesis, Exodus, 1 Samuel), in sacrificial regulations (Leviticus-Deuteronomy), and in passages using *ṣō'n* metaphorically in reference to the people and community (Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Zechariah, Psalms).

3. *Meaning*. The basic meaning in all the Semitic dialects is "small livestock," referring primarily to sheep and goats collectively in flocks or as possessions. Hence *ṣō'n* frequently parallels *'ēḏer* (Gen. 29:2-3; Jer. 13:20; Ezk. 34:12, etc.) or is specified more closely by *'ēḏer* (Gen. 29:2; Joel 1:18; Mic. 5:7[8]) or *miqneh* (Gen. 26:14; 47:17; 2 Ch. 32:29). The meaning "flock," albeit as a metaphor, is emphatically supported by the construct expression *ṣō'n 'āḏām* (Ezk. 36:38).

Like *šôr* and *ḥᵃmôr* (Dt. 5:14), *śeh* and *šôr* (Lev. 27:26), so also can *ṣō'n* together with *bāqār* (Lev. 1:2) be classified among the "domesticated animals" *(bᵉhēmâ)*.[14] In enumerations of possessions or spoils, *ṣō'n* constitutes an independent category to be distinguished from *bāqār, 'elep, šôr, ḥᵃmôr* or *'āṯôn, sûs*, and *gāmāl*. The terms *ṣō'n* and *bāqār* together frequently constitute what amounts to a fixed expression, with the sequence *ṣō'n ûḇāqār* occurring 44 times and the reversal *bāqār wᵉṣō'n* (esp. in sacrificial regulations) 25 times.[15]

In contrast to this external delimitation, *ṣō'n* as a collective term is quite complex.

---

8. *BLe*, §61m.
9. *KBL*², II, 808.
10. *DNSI*, II, 954.
11. *HAL*, III, 992b.
12. *GesB*, 670; and others; cf. E. Jenni, *TLOT*, II, 561.
13. *HAL*, III, 992b.
14. See *AuS*, VI, 171.
15. → בָּקָר *bāqār*, II, 210-11.

1 S. 25:2 uses *ṣō'n* to refer to "sheep" alone while excluding goats.[16] Since the context explicitly also involves sheepshearing *(gzz)*, *ṣō'n* in comparable passages probably also refers only to "sheep" (Gen. 31:19; 38:12-13; Dt. 15:19).

Apart from its metaphorical reference to groups of persons (people, community),[17] *ṣō'n* can be specified more closely by the following terms and species. The terms *keḇeś/keśeḇ* and *'ēz* (Gen. 30:32; Lev. 1:10; 3:6-7,12, etc.) refer generally to lambs and kids. The term *śeh* (Gen. 30:32; Ex. 21:37[22:1]; Ezk. 34:17, etc.) frequently refers to individual animals within the small-livestock flock (sheep or goat; Ex. 12:5; Num. 15:11; Dt. 14:4). Designations for female animals include *kiḇśâ* (Gen. 21:28-29; Lev. 14:10; Nu. 6:14; 2 S. 12:3-4,6), and *kiśbâ* and *śᵉ'îraṯ 'izzîm* in Lev. 5:6. The mothers or dams of the flock are called *rᵉḥēleyḵā wᵉ'izzeyḵā* in Gen. 31:38, and *'ālôṯ* (qal fem. ptcp. of the root *'wl*) in Ps. 78:71. The latter can refer not only to the animals that "nurse, give suck," but also those that "suckle" (Gen. 33:13). Ex. 22:29 uses *'ēm* to refer to "mother animal" ("dam") in general. The translation of *'aštᵉrôṯ* as "mother animal, dam,"[18] should probably be altered on the basis of the parallel term *šᵉgar*, "litter," in Dt. 7:13; 28:4,18,51 to "increase, addition (to the family), young animals."[19]

Designations for male animals include *'ayil*, "ram" (Gen. 31:38; Lev. 5:15,18,25(6:6); Ezk. 34:17; 43:23,25, etc.), *'attûḏ*, "billy goat, ram" (Gen. 31:10,12; Ezk. 34:17, etc.), and *gᵉḏî*, "small goat, kid," with the latter frequently referring to goats (*gᵉḏî 'izzîm*, Gen. 27:9,16; 38:17; Cant. 1:8, etc.). The terms *śā'îr* (Gen. 37:31; Lev. 4:23; 9:3, etc.) and *tayiš* (Gen. 30:35; 32:15[14]; 2 Ch. 17:11; Prov. 30:31) also generally refer to the billy goat. In Am. 6:4 lambs are called *kārîm miṣṣō'n*, and in Ps. 114:4,6, *bᵉnê ṣō'n*.

4. *LXX*. The LXX most frequently translates *ṣō'n* as *próbaton* (219 times; also in Ps. 8:8[7] for *ṣōneh*). In isolated instances it also uses *próbaton* for *śeh*, less frequently for *keḇeś, kiḇśâ, keśeḇ*, and *rāḥēl*.[20] The next most frequent choice is the semantically related *poimníon*, which translates *ṣō'n* 26 times, 18 of which occur in 1/2 Samuel (*próbaton* is used only 4 times here); *ktḗnos* occurs 12 times, which in the LXX frequently translates *miqneh*. 2 Ch. 7:5 uses *bóskēma*, and Jer. 23:3 already interprets *ṣō'n* as *laós*. In Job 30:1 the LXX translates *kalḇê ṣō'nî* as *kynṓn tṓn emṓn nomádōn*, and renders *ša'ar haṣṣō'n* in Neh. 3:1,32; 12:39 as *tḗn pýlēn tḗn probatikḗn*.

II. 1. *Domesticated and Flock Animals*. Sheep and goats were among the earliest domesticated animals in the Near East. In Palestine the goat was the first animal to be domesticated (toward the end of the 8th millennium B.C.E.), while the sheep came from the east only during the early 6th millennium (so Brentjes). Because they required the

---

16. See H. J. Stoebe, *Das erste Buch Samuelis. KAT* VIII/1 (1973), 446.
17. See III.2 below.
18. Originally suggested by *GesTh*, II, 1083; cf. *AuS*, VI, 191-92.
19. *GesB*, 627; G. von Rad, *Deuteronomy. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1966), in loc.; *HAL*, II, 899, is undecided.
20. *TDNT*, VI, 689.

same kind of pasturing, these two animals constituted the category "small livestock" *(ṣō'n)* as distinguished from those domesticated animals that were used occasionally or even exclusively for work.

a. The OT tradition itself seems to acknowledge this development of domestication when it mentions the two basic professions as agriculture and livestock herding, and refers to Abel as a "small-livestock herder" *(rōʿēh ṣō'n,* Gen. 4:2 [NRSV "keeper of sheep"]). The creation narratives speak either about land animals in general *(ḥayyaṯ haśśāḏeh,* Gen. 2:19), or, if mentioning the main kinds, about livestock *(bᵉhēmâ,* Gen. 1:24-25). Ps. 8:8(7) constitutes an exception here, since in praising creation it introduces the various animals under human dominion by first mentioning small livestock *(ṣōneh)* and cattle *(ʾᵃlāp̄îm).*

b. The *ṣō'n* in and of itself constitutes the economic foundation for nomadic life. "Once he begins to raise cattle as well as flocks, the shepherd ceases to be a true nomad. He settles in one place, begins to cultivate the land and to build houses."[21]

The patriarchal stories reflect this sociohistorical shift. On the one hand, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are assumed to have owned both small and large livestock *(ṣō'n ûḇāqār,* Gen. 12:16; 26:14; 32:8[7]); on the other, the J/E narratives are set largely in the milieu of small-livestock herders or shepherds, i.e., among nomads (29:1-30; 30:25–31:21; 37). It comes as no surprise, then, that before the audience with Pharaoh, Joseph advises his brothers, "You shall say, 'Your servants have been keepers of livestock *('anšê miqneh)* from our youth, even until now, both we and our ancestors' . . . because all shepherds *(rōʿēh ṣō'n)* are abhorrent to the Egyptians" (46:34).

c. Not surprisingly, information and statements concerning small-livestock herding and husbandry appear in narratives reflecting the patriarchal period and the period before Israel became a state. The patriarchs, like Moses (Ex. 3:1) and David as well (1 S. 16:11,19; 17:15ff.), were small-livestock herders, and the existence of both the individual and the clan or tribe during this period was still determined largely by the search for pastureland and water as the basic requirements for small livestock.[22] Some of the most popular pasturelands included the plain of the Jordan (Gen. 13:10), the Transjordan (Nu. 32; Mic. 7:14), and the region of "Gedor" (1 Ch. 4:39). In areas without natural sources of water, the flocks were dependent on the reservoirs or wells dug specifically for the animals (Gen. 21:30; 26:15ff.). Indeed, the watering of animals is sometimes used as a narrative motif of "first encounter" (Gen. 29:2ff.; Ex. 2:15ff.; see also Gen. 24:11ff.).[23] Gen. 30:38-39 presupposes that the animals bred *(yḥm)* when they came to drink, which is why Jacob implements his "animal magic" here, prompting the flocks to breed with the desired colors; "thus the man became exceedingly rich" because of his "striped" *(ʿᵃquddîm),* "speckled" *(nᵉquddîm),* and "spotted" *(ṭᵉluʾîm)* young animals. Moreover, he was also able to separate "feebler" *(ʿᵃṭup̄îm)* and "stronger" *(qᵉšurîm)* animals from one another (vv. 41ff.).

---

21. *AncIsr,* 3.
22. See *AuS,* VI, 208ff., 271ff.
23. See in this regard C. Westermann, *Genesis 12–36* (Eng. trans. 1985), 385-87.

d. Care of small livestock was the task of the entire family (see Gen. 29:6; Ex. 2:15ff.). Laban himself walks among his flocks (Gen. 30:32), and Jacob sends Joseph to see about the well-being *(šālôm)* of the flock (Gen. 37:14ff.). The wise person pays attention to the "condition of the flock" *(pᵉnê ṣō'n)*, for it does not last forever *(lᵉ'ôlām*, Prov. 27:23-24; cf. Eccl. 2:7 in context). Together with other goods, *ṣō'n* is counted among Yahweh's blessings (Gen. 24:35; Dt. 7:13; 8:13; 28:4), which Israel can certainly lose if they fall away from Yahweh (Dt. 28:18,31,51; Jer. 5:17) but which they can hope to regain during the new salvific period (Isa. 7:21-22; 61:5; Jer. 31:12; 33:12-13).

e. The value of *ṣō'n* derives on the one hand from the meat and milk and on the other from the sheep's wool and goathair the flocks provide. Ezekiel, e.g., reproaches Israel's false shepherds, telling them "you consume the 'milk' [read *ḥālāḇ*], you clothe yourselves with the wool *(ṣamer)*, you slaughter the fatlings *(bᵉrî'â)*" (34:3; cf. Isa. 22:13). Jacob's insistence that he has not eaten any "rams" *('êlê ṣō'n)* of Laban's flocks attests the value of this animal's meat (Gen. 31:38). By contrast, the "gourmets of Samaria" prefer to eat lambs (Am. 6:4). In addition to bread, wine, and other food, Abigail also brings David "five sheep ready dressed" (*Q 'ᵃśûyōṯ;* 1 S. 25:18). While fleeing from Absalom, his food includes "curds *(ḥem'â)* and sheep" (MT) and "curds from the flock" (Syr. *wḥ'wt' d'n';* 2 S. 17:29; cf. 1 Ch. 12:40). According to Dt. 32:14 and Isa. 7:22, the food of the salvific age will include dairy products.

f. The only fixed structure the OT mentions in connection with small-livestock husbandry are the "sheepfolds" (*giḏrōṯ ṣō'n*, Nu. 32:16; 1 S. 24:3), primarily a night pen surrounded by a fence or wall. Hab. 3:17 may refer to the same structure with the term *miḵlâ*,[24] and it can probably also be conjectured in Mic. 2:12 following Tg. and Vulg. (read *baṣṣirâ* for *boṣrâ*, "in the pen"[25]). O. Eissfeldt suspects the meaning "forked pen" behind the dual *mišpᵉṯayim* in Gen. 49:14; Jgs. 5:16.[26]

2. *As Possessions.* It was not only in the seminomadic sphere that the *ṣō'n* constituted the larger part of a person's possessions. Even if the numbers concerning the size of the flocks or quantity of animals taken as spoils in the OT are largely fictitious, one can nonetheless see that in relationship to other domesticated animals, the *ṣō'n* was clearly the most numerous (cf. Nu. 31:32; 1 S. 25:2; 1 Ch. 5:21; Job 1:3; 42:12).

a. Hardly a single enumeration of the possessions *(miqneh)* of a family, tribe, or king does not mention *ṣō'n*. In the patriarchal narratives a change does occur in the value of the *ṣō'n* in that the *ṣō'n* generally opens the enumeration of possessions (Gen. 12:16; 13:5; 20:14, etc.),[27] whereas in enumerations of royal possessions it moves to the rear (2 Ch. 32:29; cf. Ex. 9:3; Eccl. 2:7). A text such as 2 K. 5:26 reflects the change that cultivated or settled life had on such assessments: "Is this a time to accept

---

24. W. Rudolph, *Micha — Nahum — Habakuk — Zephanja. KAT* XIII/3 (1975), 239.

25. Ibid., 62.

26. O. Eissfeldt, "Gabelhürden im Ostjordanland," *KlSchr*, III (1966), 61-66; cf. also *BRL*², 317.

27. → בָּקָר *bāqār*, II, 211-12.

money and to accept clothing, olive orchards and vineyards, sheep and oxen, and male and female slaves?" Deuteronomy reflects the same influence when it mentions the products of the field before livestock among the blessings of the promised land (7:13; 28:4) and in its comminatory series (28:18,51).

b. Nonetheless, the *ṣō'n* played an important role in the economy of the royal sphere as well. According to 1 S. 8:17, the king could claim a tenth of all flocks, and according to 1 K. 5:3(4:23), Solomon's court daily also required "ten fat oxen, twenty pasture-fed cattle, and one hundred sheep." It is especially in connection with the temple and cultic celebrations that the OT attests the use of extremely high quantities of both large and small livestock (1 K. 8:63; 2 Ch. 7:5; 29:33; 30:24), part of which came from the king's own possessions (*mērᵉḵûš*, 2 Ch. 35:7). Hence in its list of civic officials in charge of the royal Davidic property, 1 Ch. 27:31 specifically mentions a certain Hagrite by the name of Jaziz who was in charge of the flocks.

c. The value of *ṣō'n* in individual cases can be derived from passages involving law, trade, and contracts. As a possession, the *ṣō'n* was protected from alienation. Ex. 21:37(22:1) stipulates that anyone who steals a sheep *(śeh)* and slaughters or sells it must pay back four head of *ṣō'n*. Dtn legislation reminds the Israelites that they were themselves once slaves in Egypt; accordingly, when a Hebrew debt slave is released, he is to be given a commensurate portion of the flock, the threshing floor, and the winepress (Dt. 15:14).

The *ṣō'n* can also function as currency. Judah and Tamar negotiate the price of a kid (Gen. 38:17), and Joseph distributes food as payment for flocks (47:17).

Abraham sends Abimelech both large and small livestock in order to seal a covenant (*bᵉrîṯ*, Gen. 21:27ff.). Seven lambs *(kᵉḇāśōṯ)* from the flock serve as a witness (*'ēḏâ*, v. 30), making the acceptance of the gift into a "public legal act."[28]

Together with other gifts, however, the *ṣō'n* can also function as compensation (Gen. 12:16; 20:14) or as tribute (2 Ch. 17:11).

d. War narratives frequently mention *ṣō'n* as part of the booty (Nu. 31:28ff.; 1 S. 14:32; 15:9; 27:9, etc.).[29] In most cases *ṣō'n* is mentioned together with *bāqār*.[30] Like all other spoils of war, *ṣō'n* in connection with the Yahweh war is subject to specific legislation concerning its distribution (Nu. 31:28ff.) and banning (1 S. 15:9,15).

3. *In Comparisons.* When the term *ṣō'n* is used in comparisons, the boundary between literal and metaphorical meaning frequently becomes fluid.[31] With reference to human beings, *ṣō'n* reflects the salvific condition of the people itself (Ezk. 36:37), a clan (Ps. 107:41), a city (Ezk. 36:38), or even of nature (Ps. 65:14[13]). By contrast, disaster has already struck when a country becomes a pen *(mirbāṣ)* for flocks (Ezk. 25:5) or when folds *(giḏrōṯ)* are built on it (Zeph. 2:6). At Yahweh's theophany, nature "skips" *(rqd)* like rams or like lambs (Ps. 114:4,6), as does what for Job is the unjusti-

28. Westermann, *Genesis 12–36*, 349.
29. See also *KAI* 131.31.
30. → בָּקָר *bāqār*, II, 214.
31. See III.2 below.

fied joy of the wicked's *(rᵉšā'îm)* children (21:11). Other comparisons focus even more closely on individual elements characterizing life in a flock. Jeremiah exhorts Israel to "flee from Babylon, and go out of the land of the Chaldeans, and be like male goats leading the flock" (Jer. 50:8). Job would not even have considered the fathers of those who mock him to be the equals of "the dogs of my flock" (*kalḇê ṣō'n,* 30:1).

4. *Topography.* Topographical allusions involving *ṣō'n* include the "Sheep Gate" (*ša'ar haṣṣō'n,* Neh. 3:1,32; 12:39), one of Jerusalem's city gates probably located in the eastern wall, north of the temple precinct during the time of the second temple.[32] Interpreters disagree whether *giḏrōṯ haṣṣō'n* in 1 S. 24:3 represents a place-name[33] or whether the context rather suggests the presence of actual folds.[34]

III. 1. *Place of Calling.* Am. 7:15 justifies the prophet's calling by saying, "Yahweh took me from following the flock" *(wayyiqqāḥēnî yhwh mē'aḥᵃrê haṣṣō'n).* 2 S. 7:8 uses almost the same expression with regard to David, pointing out that he will be the *nāgîḏ* over Yahweh's people Israel (par. 1 Ch. 17:7; cf. Ps. 78:70). Moses too was called while he was leading his flock "beyond the wilderness" (*'aḥar hammiḏbār,* Ex. 3:1).

Although all these passages seem to emphasize that Yahweh takes *(lāqaḥ)* these people out of their normal existence when he calls them, the attendant theological reflection in the case of David (see 2 S. 5:2) and to a certain extent of Moses as well (see Isa. 63:11) does reveal a relationship between calling and commission in that those who are called from shepherding are destined to tend *(rā'â)* the flock Israel. Ps. 78:70-71 fully articulates what resonates beneath the surface in 2 S. 5:2 and 7:8: "He [Yahweh] chose his servant David, and took him from the sheepfolds *(wayyiqqāḥēhû)* . . . he brought him to be the shepherd of his people Jacob, of Israel, his inheritance."[35]

2. *As a Metaphor for the People and Community.* The language in Ps. 78 has been strongly influenced by both Deuteronomy and the wisdom tradition, suggesting that the psalm itself is a more recent composition.[36] Nonetheless, the images of shepherd and flock in this broad "historical psalm" provide a comprehensive introduction to the metaphorical use of *ṣō'n:* "He [Yahweh] led out his people like sheep *(ṣō'n),* and guided *(nhg)* them in the wilderness like a flock (*'ēḏer*)" (v. 52; cf. vv. 51-55). The end of the psalm presents a corresponding image of David: "With upright heart he tended them *(rā'â),* and guided *(nhg)* them with skillful hand" (v. 72).

a. The idea of God or the king as the shepherd *(rō'eh)* and of the people as his flock *(ṣō'n, 'ēḏer)* is a common motif in the ancient Near East;[37] in the case of the OT, there

---

32. See *BHHW,* II, 833-34, ills. 3, 839, 843.

33. *GTTOT,* §708.

34. Stoebe, *Samuelis,* 434.

35. See H. Schult, "Amos 7,15a und die Legitimation des Aussenseiters," *Probleme biblischer Theologie. FS G. von Rad* (Munich, 1971), 462-78.

36. See H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150* (Eng. trans. 1989), 122-23.

37. → רעה *rā'â;* cf. Dürr, Hamp, Seibert, Jeremias.

is no need to pose the question whether the motif derives from nomadic life or the cult.[38] In any event the Davidic tradition sufficiently demonstrates that Israel encountered this image both as a metaphor already present in tradition and as a part of its actual, daily surroundings (see 1 S. 16:11,19; 17:15,20,34). W. Zimmerli is thus quite correct in pointing out that "the conventional language has been filled over and over again with insight."[39]

b. One essential feature of this metaphor is that the two poles mutually determine one another. That is, passages that speak of God or the king as a shepherd are presupposing the people as a flock even if the term itself is not used (see 2 S. 5:2; 7:8; Ps. 23; the reverse in 2 S. 24:17; Ps. 74:1; Isa. 53:6, etc.). Hence the question of the emergence and use of the metaphor *ṣō'n* in reference to the people and community cannot be restricted to an examination merely of the term itself. That the majority of occurrences date to exilic-postexilic prophecy and to psalms dating largely to the same period (Ps. 44; 49; 74; 77; 79; 95; 100) shows not that the metaphor itself arose during this period, but rather only that it was more broadly used during the period. Of course, the notion of Yahweh as Israel's shepherd emerges quite early and already presupposes this metaphor (Gen. 49:24; Ps. 80:2[1]; Hos. 4:16).[40]

c. As a metaphor *ṣō'n* can have several different meanings. Even though in the vast majority of instances *ṣō'n* refers to Israel (Psalms; Jer. 23:1-2; Ezk. 34; Zech. 11), it can also refer to personal enemies (Jer. 12:3) and foreign nations (Isa. 13:14; Jer. 49:20; 50:45; Mic. 5:7[8]). On the one hand, the metaphor plays off the observation that any *ṣō'n* left alone and without protection, guidance, and a shepherd (Zech. 10:2) inevitably meets with disaster. Micaiah son of Imlah sees "all Israel scattered *(pwṣ)* on the mountains, like sheep that have no shepherd" (1 K. 22:17; cf. Nu. 27:17). The psalmist opens the "prayer of the people" with the exhortation, "Give ear, O Shepherd of Israel, you who lead *(nhg)* Joseph like a flock!" (Ps. 80:2[1]). Without a shepherd the *ṣō'n* is "like a hunted gazelle, or like sheep with no one to gather" (*qbṣ*, Isa. 13:14), like a flock into which a lion bursts and drags away even "the little ones of the flock" (*ṣᵉʿîrê haṣṣō'n*, Jer. 49:19-20; 50:44-45;[41] cf. also Mic. 5:7[8]). On the other hand, such unprotected livestock runs the risk of being killed and slaughtered. Jeremiah hopes his enemies will be pulled out like "sheep for the slaughter *(lᵉṭiḇḥâ)*, and set . . . apart for the day of slaughter *(lᵉyôm hᵃrēgâ)*" (12:3, to be read in the context of 11:20a,b [*BHS*]). The same motif resonates in Jeremiah's oracle against the "lords of the flock" (*'addîrê haṣṣō'n*, 25:34ff.), which portrays the fate of the kings, their peoples, and their lands metaphorically as the slaughtering of sacrificial animals.[42] Israel itself laments, "you [Yahweh] have made us like sheep for slaughter" (*kᵉṣō'n ma'ᵃḵāl*, Ps. 44:12[11]; cf. also v. 23[22] with *kᵉṣō'n ṭiḇḥâ*), and Deutero-Zechariah uses the metaphor in his

38. See H. Gottlieb, "Die Tradition von David als Hirten," *VT* 17 (1967) 190-200.

39. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1983), 214.

40. See in this regard V. Maag, "Der Hirte Israels," *Kulturkontakt und Religion: Gesammelte Studien zur allgemeinen und alttestamentlichen Religionsgeschichte* (Göttingen, 1980), 111ff.

41. Regarding textual considerations, see W. Rudolph, *Jeremia. HAT* I/12 (³1968), 288, 291.

42. Ibid., 167.

"shepherd's vision" (11:4-17), alluding to the "flock doomed to slaughter" *(ṣō'n hahᵃrēḡâ)* for the "sheep merchants" (read *liḵna'ᵃnîyê* in vv. 7,11 instead of *lāḵēn 'ᵃnîyê*[43]).

d. In the fourth Servant Song, Israel says that "all we like sheep have gone astray *(tā'â);* we have all turned to our own way" (Isa. 53:6), suggesting in comparison to the "servant" in v. 7 that Israel itself was responsible for its own apostasy (cf. also vv. 4-5). Far more frequently, however, the metaphor is used to expose the culpability of those to whom the *ṣō'n* is entrusted. In the face of divine judgment, David confesses that "I alone have sinned, and I alone have done wickedly; but these sheep, what have they done?" (2 S. 24:17). Exilic and postexilic prophecy picks up at this point and develops the metaphor of the shepherd and flock into a reproach and commination against the leaders of the people (Jer. 23:1-2; 25:34ff.; Ezk. 34:1ff.; Zech. 11:4ff.; 13:7ff.).

e. Israel is the "flock of Yahweh's inheritance" (*ṣō'n naḥᵃlāṯeḵā,* Mic. 7:14), and Yahweh himself speaks of "my flock" (*ṣō'nî,* Jer. 23:2-3; Ezk. 34:8,10-11, etc.) and the "sheep of my pasture" (*ṣō'n mar'îṯî,* Jer. 23:1; Ezk. 34:31). The last expression probably derives from the language of prayer, where Israel uses it as a self-designation (Ps. 74:1; 79:13; 100:3; cf. also 95:7, *'am mar'îṯô wᵉṣō'n yāḏô*).[44]

Shepherds are entrusted with the *ṣō'n* (Jer. 13:20) and must answer to Yahweh, its owner, for its well-being. The attendant reproach is generally a cry of woe (*hôy,* Jer. 23:1; Ezk. 34:2; Zech. 11:17) against the shepherds who have been feeding themselves instead of the flock (Ezk. 34:2-3,10). They destroy the flock (*'bd* piel), let it run away (*ndḥ* niphal) and scatter (*pwṣ* hiphil, Jer. 23:1-2; Ezk. 34:4-5). They abandon it (*'āzaḇ,* Zech. 11:17), turn it into prey *(bzz)* and food *('oḵlâ)* for other animals (Ezk. 34:8). The "shepherd's vision" (Zech. 11:4ff.) abandons the metaphor already used by Jeremiah and Ezekiel in that the prophet himself, at Yahweh's behest, now takes on the roll of shepherd in a double, antithetical fashion (vv. 4ff.,15ff.).

This reference to false or unworthy shepherds is countered by statements describing how Yahweh himself now takes care of his flock (Jer. 23:3-4; Ezk. 34:11ff.). He gathers them in (*qbṣ* piel), takes care of them *(pāqaḏ, dāraš),* sees to them (*bqr* piel), pastures them *(rā'â),* and delivers them (*nṣl* hiphil). Ezk. 34 expands the metaphor such that Yahweh now also ensures that justice is done among the animals of the flock (*šāp̄aṭ,* vv. 17,20; cf. already v. 16, *rā'â bᵉmišpāṭ*). At the end he reestablishes the "covenantal relationship" (v. 31). The addenda to Micah (2:12; 7:14) express similar hopes.

3. *As a Sacrifice.* a. The OT tradition confirms that the *ṣō'n* was among the earliest sacrificial animals (Gen. 4:4). Together with the ox, it is mentioned frequently and in various contexts especially outside the actual sacrificial regulations (Nu. 22:40; 1 K. 1:9, etc.; Jer. 3:24; Hos. 5:6). The relationship between these passages and the fixed sacrificial regulations is not always clear. The slaughtering of both large and small live-

43. *BHS; HAL,* II, 530; W. Rudolph, *Haggai — Sacharja 1–8 — Sacharja 9–14 — Maleachi. KAT* XIII/4 (1976), 202.

44. See in this regard Kraus, *Psalms 60–150,* 247.

stock often seems to refer not only to the sacrifice itself, but also to an ensuing meal whose purpose was to establish a community of destiny (Nu. 22:40; 1 K. 1:9,19,25; 2 Ch. 18:2) or a sacral fellowship (1 K. 8:5,63; 2 Ch. 7:5; 15:11).

b. Sacrificial regulations that mention *ṣō'n* with no additional qualification refer without distinction to "sheep" or "goats." The earliest stipulations regarding Passover (Ex. 12:21) as well as the "altar law" (Ex. 20:24-26) confirm this point. The law of centralization in Deuteronomy also mentions only "large and small livestock" and stipulates that the corresponding sacrifices and offerings be made at the place appointed by Yahweh (12:6,17) and that the slaughter and consumption be carried out in the manner prescribed by Yahweh (12:21). H enumerates six transgressions that exclude both *ṣō'n* and *bāqār* as sacrificial animals (Lev. 22:21-22).

c. Although the Priestly sacrificial regulations do distinguish between the various kinds of small livestock used in sacrifices, a detailed examination of these distinctions transcends the present discussion.[45]

In Nu. 28–29 the "sacrificial calendar" omits the term *ṣō'n* entirely and speaks instead about "lambs," "rams," and "male goats." By contrast, Nu. 15 begins with a general introductory reference to the "herd and flock" (v. 3); then "a scale of values of the sacrificial animals rises from the (male) sheep, via the ram to the bull" (vv. 4ff.).[46] The Priestly authors stipulate that the *ṣō'n* of the earlier Passover regulations be a "lamb without blemish, a year-old male . . . from the sheep or from the goats" (Ex. 12:5). That Dt. 16:2 amplifies the earlier regulation by adding the *bāqār* shows that "an official community festival at the central cult place arose out of the Passover as a family festival."[47] Chronicles confirms this development when Hezekiah (2 Ch. 30:24) and Josiah (35:7) transfer enormous numbers of *ṣō'n* and other sacrificial animals to the people at Passover.

d. The sacrificial laws in Lev. 1ff. mention *ṣō'n* in connection with burnt offerings (*'ōlâ,* 1:10) and sacrifices of well-being (*zeḇaḥ šᵉlāmîm,* 3:6). The burnt offering required a "male without blemish, from the flock, from the sheep or goats," while the sacrifice of well-being also required an animal without blemish, though now either "male or female." Both sacrifices are called "offering" *(qorbān),*[48] with 1:2 explicating the more general reference "offering of domesticated animals *(bᵉhēmâ)*" with *bāqār* and *ṣō'n.*[49]

Like the "offering," so also did the *'āšām* not refer originally to a separate type of offering; in the first addendum (5:1-6) to the stipulations regarding the sin offering (ch. 4) it refers to a penitential act in connection with the sin offering *(ḥaṭṭā'ṯ)* requiring a "female from the flock, a sheep or a goat" (5:6). The *'āšām* does not become a "guilt offering" until the introduction of the ram as a sacrificial animal in 5:14ff. (*'ayil tāmîm min-haṣṣō'n,* 5:14ff., esp. 15,18,25; cf. Ezr. 10:19).

---

45. → עז *'ēz;* → שׂה *śeh.*
46. M. Noth, *Numbers. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1968), 114.
47. → בָּקָר *bāqār,* I, 216.
48. K. Elliger, *Leviticus. HAT* IV (1966), 34.
49. A secondary insertion according to M. Noth, *Leviticus. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1965), 21.

The male sheep in the bloom of youth and the young bull have from the earliest times (e.g., Nu. 23:2ff.; Isa. 1:11) been the customary animals sacrificed for burnt offerings and offerings of well-being.[50] Similarly, Ezk. 43:23,25 stipulate that the "young bull" and the "ram" (again with the addendum *min-haṣṣō'n*) be sacrificed as burnt offerings at the dedication of the altar, preceded by two sin offerings of a young bull and male goat (vv. 19ff.,22). The addendum in vv. 25ff. stipulates that each day for seven days the altar be cleansed and consecrated and atonement made for it with the same sacrificial animals as in vv. 21-22.[51]

e. Alongside the sacrificial regulations, the *ṣō'n* also appears in the various instructions and laws governing the presentation of firstlings *(bᵉḵôr, rē'šîṯ)* and tithes (*maʿᵃśēr,* Ex. 22:29; Lev. 27:32; Dt. 14:23,26; 15:19; 18:4; Neh. 10:37; 2 Ch. 31:6).

IV. Qumran. The word *ṣō'n* occurs 11 times in Qumran, 3 of those in connection with OT citations (CD 19:8-9; 4QpPs 37:3,6), where its meaning is restricted exclusively to *ṣō'n* as a metaphor for the people and community; in CD 19:9 it refers to the members, and in 4QpPs37 3:5-6 to the heads and leaders of the community. Ps. 151, the Davidic psalm influenced by Orphism, uses the term 3 times right at the beginning (11QPsª 28:4 [*ṣôn*], 6,10); here too the reference is to the people: "He made me the shepherd of his flock, and a ruler over his kids" (v. 1/l. 4). The term is used in the literal sense (rather than metaphorically) in the reference to the Orphic motif itself in v. 3/l. 6, and now in the *plene* orthography *ṣô'n:* "The trees praise my words and the flocks my deeds."[52] Finally, v. 7/l. 10 alludes to the classic topos of prophetic calling in the expression "from behind the flock" *(m'ḥr hṣw'n).* The Temple Scroll uses *ṣō'n* in connection with firstling fruits and animals (11QT 43:15; 52:7,9) and in its prohibition against secular slaughter (53:3; cf. Dt. 12:15). 4QCatª (177) 5-6:15 alludes to Isa. 22:13.

Waschke

---

50. Elliger, *Leviticus,* 75.

51. See Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2,* 435.

52. Cf. M. Smith, "Psalm 151, David, Jesus, and Orpheus," *ZAW* 93 (1981) 247-53; H. J. Fabry, "11QPsª und die Kanonizität des Psalters," *Freude an der Weisung des Herrn. FS H. Gross* (Stuttgart, ²1987), 45-67.

צֶאֱצָאִים ṣeʾeṣāʾîm

Contents: I. 1. Etymology; 2. Meaning; 3. Occurrences. II. OT: 1. Plant Offspring; 2. Metaphorical Use: Offspring as Descendants. III. 1. LXX and Vulgate; 2. Qumran.

I. 1. *Etymology.* Although Hebrew lexicons (including *HAL*) generally compare *ṣeʾeṣāʾîm* with Arab. *ḍuʾḍuʾ* and *ḍiʾḍiʾ*, *ḍuʾḍuʾ* is an onomatopoeic designation of an otherwise unidentified bird characterized on the basis of its call. Only *ḍiʾḍiʾ* refers to a relationship in an ascending and descending line.[1] T. Nöldeke's attempt to derive the word from the root *wḍʾ* is untenable because *waḍuʾa* means "be ritually pure, clean," making it difficult to establish a persuasive semantic relationship with *ḍiʾḍiʾ* in the sense of "derivation, origin, lineage," unless one begins with the basic meaning "having come forth pure," "be pure."[2] Ethiopic attests the form *ḍāʾḍāʾ*, "abortion, embryo, fetus" (e.g., Nu. 12:12; Job 3:16; 1 Cor. 15:8),[3] a reduplicated construction deriving from the root *wḍʾ*. Its meaning, however, is more restricted than that of the Hebrew (though cf. in Hebrew the fem. subst. ptcp. *yôṣēʾṯ*, "miscarriage," Ps. 144:14). A related form with palatalization is found in Amharic as *ḍāḍut*, "chick."[4] W. Leslau rejects any relationship with Heb. *ṣeʾeṣāʾîm* probably because he views *ḍāḍut* as an onomatopoeia.[5] The comparable root in Aramaic is *yʿʾ*. The construction related to Heb. *ṣeʾeṣāʾîm* is *ʿāʿyāṯāʾ*, "battlements."[6] The Heb. *ṣeʾeṣāʾîm* is semantically most closely related to the verb *yṣʾ*, "go forth," whereas comparable words in other Semitic languages have more restricted meanings.

2. *Meaning.* The noun is constructed according to the model *qeṭalṭal*[7] with apheresis of the initial radical *y* and as a reduplicated construction of the remaining basis of the verb *yāṣāʾ*, "go/come out, go forth/away, start forth." As in English, the literal meaning "what has come forth" in the sense of "offspring" can refer concretely to the young shoots of a plant in the sense of "buds," and then also metaphorically to human "descendants" (in the more specific sense of "grandchildren"). The noun *yāṣîʾ* (2 Ch. 32:21 *Q*), constructed from the complete root, also means "descendant," similarly also the ptcp. *yōṣeʾê yerēḵô*, "offspring of his loins" (Gen. 46:26).

---

1. M. Ullmann, *Wörterbuch der klassischen arabischen Sprache* (Wiesbaden, 1970ff.), s.v., lists 14 occurrences.
2. *ZDMG* 40 (1886) 725; idem, review of *Texte zur arabischen Lexikographie*, ed. A. Haffner (Leipzig, 1905), *ZA* 19 (1905/1906) 155; idem, *Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft* (Strasbourg, 1904), 112 n. 3.
3. See *LexLingAeth*, 947-48.
4. See F. Praetorius, *Die Amharische Sprache* (1879; repr. Hildesheim, 1970), 84.
5. *Contributions*, 43.
6. See G. Hoffmann, *ZDMG* 32 (1878) 753 n. 3; Brockelmann, *LexSyr*, 537b.
7. See *GK*, §84n; and *VG*, §178.

3. *Occurrences.* In the OT the noun *ṣeʾᵉṣāʾîm* occurs only as *pluralia tantum*, including 7 times in Isaiah and 4 in Job. It occurs twice in Sirach (44:12, only ms. M; 47:20, only ms. B). The earliest occurrences are probably those in Deutero-Isaiah (42:5; 44:3; 48:19), since Isa. 22:24 is a later addendum and 34:1 is postexilic.

II. OT.

1. *Plant Offspring.* In three passages (Isa. 34:1; 42:5; Job 31:8), *ṣeʾᵉṣāʾîm* refers to "offspring" in the literal sense as young plant offshoots. Isa. 42:5-9 hymnically extols Yahweh as the creator of heaven and earth and "what comes from it," referring possibly to the "offspring" not only of plants but of animals as well (cf. the hiphil of *yṣʾ* in Gen. 1:12,24).[8] When the universal judgment is announced in Isa. 34:1, those summoned as witnesses include the earth and all its creatures, "the world, and all that comes from it." In the concluding monologue, Job tries to demonstrate his innocence by asserting that if ever he were greedy, "then let me sow, and another eat; and let my plant shoots be rooted out" (31:8). His enemies will eat what he sows and will tear out the seedlings from the fields; they will destroy the shoots that are just sprouting and are ready for transplanting, so that Job will lose even that harvest.

The LXX misunderstands v. 8b in translating *árrizos dé genoímēn*. According to A. Knobel, the suffix indicates that the reference is to Job's children rather than to the offspring or sprouts of his fields or gardens.[9] Both the Vulg., "et progenies mea eradicetur," and, following it, Luther (1545), "and let my family be rooted out," translate in this sense. V. 8a, however, clearly shows that v. 8b refers to young plant sprouts.

2. *Metaphorical Use.* Isa. 22:24 illustrates the transition from concrete to metaphorical use within a comparison. The members of Eliakim's family are derisively called "offshoots and leaves" (if *ṣᵉpiʿôṯ* does mean "leaves") because of their attempt to profit from the advancement of their relatives.[10] According to Job 27:14, the descendants of the wicked will starve, while 21:8 bemoans the apparent good fortune of the wicked, whose offspring are well established. In his first response, Eliphaz assures Job that his descendants will be numerous and his offspring "like the grass of the earth" (5:25). In Deutero- and Trito-Isaiah, promises of salvation and blessing apply to descendants as well. "I will pour my spirit upon your [Jacob's] descendants [lit. 'seed'], and my blessing on your offspring" (Isa. 44:3). In 48:19 Israel is told that if only it would follow God's commandments, its seed would be like the sand and its offspring like the grains of that sand. Trito-Isaiah emphasizes in 65:23[11] that the people of the salvific period will be Yahweh's blessed, "and their descendants as well." Isa. 61:9 refers similarly to Israel as the seed blessed by Yahweh. Israel will be known

---

8. So K. Elliger, *Deuterojesaja (40,1–45,7). BK* XI/1 (1978), 231.

9. *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* (1842), 490-92.

10. See H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27* (Eng. trans. 1997), 392.

11. According to K. Koenen, "Ethik und Eschatologie im Tritojesajabuch" (diss., Tübingen, 1987), 137ff., 189ff., the two verses can be ascribed neither to Trito-Isaiah nor to the redactor.

among nations as the people blessed by God along with "their descendants," i.e., with all subsequent generations.

The hymn in honor of ancestors in Sir. 44ff. asserts that the descendants of these blessed men will stand by the covenants; for their sake (44:12b, ms. M), the descendants or offspring will keep the memory of their faithful ancestors alive by abiding in the same loyalty to the law. By contrast, 47:20 insists that because of his excesses with women, Solomon brought wrath down on his own descendants.

The term *ṣeʾeṣāʾîm* often parallels *zeraʿ* (Job 5:25; 21:8; Isa. 44:3; 48:19; 61:9; 65:23; Sir. 44:12). K. Elliger suggests that at least Isa. 61:9 is using the stylistic device known as "stretching,"[12] though it is questionable whether this constitutes synonymous parallelism. Job 27:14 might help illuminate this question, since it uses *ṣeʾeṣāʾîm* parallel with *bānāyw,* suggesting a reference to sons and grandchildren (cf. Tg., with 7 occurrences of *bny bny,* "children's children").

III. 1. *LXX and Vulgate.* The LXX translates *ṣeʾeṣāʾîm* 5 times as *tá tékna* (Job 5:25; 21:8; Isa. 44:3; Sir. 44:12; 47:20), 3 times as *tá ékgona* (Isa. 48:19; 61:9; 65:23), and once each as *ho laós* (34:1) and *tá en autḗ* (42:5). The LXX abbreviates Job 31:8[13] and gives Job 27:14 and Isa. 22:24 a free rendering.[14]

The Vulg. translates twice each as *progenies* (Job 5:25; 31:8), *stirps* (Isa. 44:3; 48:19), *nepotes* (Job 21:8; 27:14), and *germen* (Isa. 34:1; 61:9; *germinant* in 42:5). The Vulg. deviates from the MT in both 22:24 and 65:23.

2. *Qumran.* The term *ṣʾṣʾ* occurs 7 times in the Qumran texts. The sometimes fragmentary contexts suggest that these texts understand the word just as does the OT. In 3 instances the reference is to plants (1QM 10:13; 12:10; 1QH 13:9), and in 4 instances to human offspring (1QH 1:18; 2:38; 1QSb 2:28; 1QH fr. 10:8). 1QM 10:13 unmistakably recalls Isa. 42:5 in hymnically extolling Israel's God as the "creator of the earth and of the laws dividing it into desert and grassland, and of all that it brings forth." Hence it is questionable whether one can interpret *ṣʾṣʾ* in the Qumran texts without considering OT usage as does J. Maier, who begins with the general translation "offshoot, runner," in understanding the word as a reference to plants, produce, fruits (e.g., in 1QM 10:13), to the ends of the earth (in 1QM 12:10), or to branches (in 1QH 1:18). By contrast, Y. Yadin understands *ṣʾṣʾ* in 1QM 10:13 as a reference to streams.[15]

Kellermann†

---

12. *Die Einheit des Tritojesaja. BWANT* 45 (1928), 54, 72; cf. also S. Sekine, "Redaktionsgeschichtliche Studie zum Tritojesajabuch" (diss., Munich, 1984), 296.

13. See II.1 above.

14. See A. van der Kooij, *Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches. OBO* 35 (1981), 56ff.

15. See J. Maier, *Die Texte vom Toten Meer,* 2 vols. (Munich, 1960), II, 126.

צָבָא ṣāḇā'

Contents: I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences. II. OT: 1. Verb; 2. Noun. III. 1. Qumran; 2. LXX.

I. 1. *Etymology.* Etymologically Heb. *ṣāḇā'* corresponds to Akk. *ṣabā'um/ṣabû,* "go into battle,"[1] Eth. *ḍab'a/ṣab'a,* "go to war," and OSA *ḍb',* "do battle, carry on war."[2] Lane's suggestion that Arab. *ḍaba'a* means "conceal oneself, duck," and "take refuge" does not fit semantically.[3] On the other hand, L. Kopf's suggested meaning "assemble," although semantically more persuasive, is poorly attested.[4] Because of the Eth. and OSA *ḏ,* Arab. *ṣaba'a,* "come forth, arise, come over someone," must also be excluded.

The question is whether the noun *ṣāḇā',* "army, host," derives from the verb or itself represents the primary noun from which the verb was constructed. The Ugar. *ṣb'* means "army" and "warrior" and is also used to refer to a ship's crew;[5] similarly, Akk. *ṣābu* means "people, soldiers, workers,"[6] Eth. *ṣab'ē* means "war," and Eth. *ṣabā'īt* "army, host" (cf. OSA *ḍb',* "battle"). It is doubtful that Phoenician genuinely has the word *ṣb'* in the meaning "work, accomplishment."[7]

2. *Occurrences.* In the OT the verb *ṣāḇā'* occurs 10 times in the qal and twice in the hiphil. Apart from the divine appellation *ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ,* the noun *ṣāḇā'* occurs 201 times, primarily in Numbers (77 occurrences) and the narrative books (58 times in the Dtr History, 40 in the Chronicler's History). The noun attests the pl. form *-ôṯ* approximately 300 times and only twice the form *-îm* (Ps. 103:21; 148:2 *Q*). In neither of the two passages does the understanding as a collective plural present any problems.[8]

II. OT.

1. *Verb.* The verb usually means "go into battle, fight" (with *'al*). Israel goes into battle against Midian (Nu. 31:7), and a multitude of nations will go unsuccessfully into battle against Ariel/Zion (Isa. 29:7-8). Yahweh will destroy the nations who go into battle against Jerusalem (Zech. 14:12). In Isa. 31:4 the prep. *'al* must mean "upon," i.e., Yahweh will come down to fight "upon" Mt. Zion, since v. 5 asserts that he will protect and rescue Jerusalem. The participle is used absolutely in Nu. 31:42, which speaks

---

ṣāḇā'. → צבאות *ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ.*

1. *AHw,* III, 1071.
2. Beeston, 40.
3. Lane, I/5, 1763.
4. L. Kopf, "Arabische Etymologien und Parallelen zum Bibelwörterbuch," *VT* 8 (1958) 196.
5. *WUS,* no. 2299; perhaps as a verb in *KTU* 1.14, II, 53.
6. *AHw,* III, 1072.
7. See *KAI,* II, 63, on 46.5.
8. See Michel, 46.

about the spoils of "the troops"; the equivalent in v. 36, *yōṣᵉʾîm baṣṣāḇāʾ*, refers to "those who had gone out to war."

Some scholars suggest the presence of a more generalized meaning in a few passages using the *figura etymologica liṣbōʾ ṣāḇāʾ*, "do service." In this context Nu. 4:23 is not entirely clear. Moses is to muster the Gershonites, namely, *kol-habbāʾ liṣbōʾ ṣāḇāʾ laʿᵃḇōḏ ʿᵃḇōḏâ bᵉʾōhel môʿēḏ*. Although some translations understand *habbāʾ liṣbōʾ ṣāḇāʾ* to mean "men capable of military service" who are to "perform service" in the tent of meeting, the expression *liṣbōʾ ṣāḇāʾ* could just as easily be synonymous with *laʿᵃḇōḏ ʿᵃḇōḏâ* and mean "in order to do service." Nu. 8:24 supports this understanding in its simple assertion that the Levites *yāḇôʾ liṣbōʾ ṣāḇāʾ baʿᵃḇōḏaṯ ʾōhel môʿēḏ*, i.e., "do service" at the tent of meeting; here *ṣāḇāʾ* apparently means simply "service" (see discussion below). Ex. 38:8 speaks similarly about the women "who served at the entrance to the tent of meeting" *(haṣṣōḇᵉʾōṯ ʾᵃšer ṣāḇᵉʾû peṯaḥ ʾōhel môʿēḏ)*. These women probably performed simpler tasks such as cleaning; this reference cannot possibly be to military service. 1 S. 2:22 also mentions these *nāšîm ṣōḇᵉʾōṯ*, though without clearly stating their tasks; we learn only that the sons of Eli slept with them.

The two hiphil passages are identical (2 K. 25:19 par. Jer. 52:25). Both involve a "secretary of the commander of the army" who "mustered" the people for military service.

2. *Noun*. a. The noun *ṣāḇāʾ* refers first of all to an army or an army unit. The order of encampment and marching in Nu. 2 enumerates the size of every tribe's "host" or "company" (vv. 4,6,8,11,13,15,19,21,23,28,30). At the departure from Sinai (10:11-36), the "companies" of the various tribes are again enumerated (vv. 14,15,16,18,20, 22,23-27). Joab "and all the army that was with him" return from a raid (2 S. 3:23). David sends Joab with the army of the *gibbôrîm* against the Ammonites (1 Ch. 19:8). References are also made to the *ʾanšê haṣṣāḇāʾ*, the "troops" (Nu. 31:21,53), to the *ʿam haṣṣāḇāʾ*, similarly the "troops" who take spoils (31:32), or the *ʾalpê haṣṣāḇāʾ*, the "thousands of the army" (v. 48); cf. also *rāʾšê haṣṣāḇāʾ*, the "officers of the army" (1 Ch. 12:15[Eng. 14]).

Isa. 34:2 tells how Yahweh is enraged against the nations *(gôyim)* and their hosts and intends to destroy them. The exodus narrative calls the departing people the "companies of Yahweh" (Ex. 12:41; cf. 7:4) or the "companies of Israel" (6:26; 12:17,51).

Three passages in the Psalms reproach Yahweh for not going out into battle with the people's armies (Ps. 44:10[9]; 60:12[10]; 108:12[11]); i.e., he fails to aid them in times of war. Ps. 68:13(12) tells how Israel's enemies, the "kings of the armies," flee before Yahweh; the reference is apparently to princes who with their armies have attacked Israel. The reference to the "company of the women who bore victory tidings *(mᵉḇaśśᵉrôṯ)*" in 68:12(11) is unique.

One fixed expression is *śar ṣāḇāʾ*, "commander of the army," with the pl. form *śārê ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ* (Gen. 21:22; Jgs. 4:2; 2 S. 19:14[13]; 1 K. 1:25; 2:32; 2 K. 5:1, etc.; the pl. appears in Dt. 20:9; 1 K. 2:5; 1 Ch. 27:3).[9] One special case involves the "commander of

---

9. → שׂר *śar*.

the army of Yahweh" who appears to Joshua (Josh. 5:14-15). This tradition is fragmentary, however, and the resulting contextual obscurity prevents us from determining whether the reference is to the commander of a celestial army (of angels or the like) or simply to a celestial army leader.

b. According to Dt. 4:19, the "host of heaven" that Israel is not permitted to worship includes "the sun, the moon, and the stars," which Yahweh has allotted to other nations. The same prohibition appears in Dt. 17:3, though here the sun and the moon appear alongside the host of heaven; the *ṣ^eḇā' haššāmayim* thus refers here only to the stars. In the accounts of syncretism in 2 K. 17:16; 21:3 (cf. 2 Ch. 33:3,5); 23:4-5, the expression "all the host of heaven" functions as a collective designation for astral worship in the larger sense. Jeremiah uses similar language. Jer. 8:2 mentions the sun, moon, and "all the host of heaven," and 19:13 the "whole host of heaven"; Zeph. 1:5 similarly mentions "those who bow down on the roofs to the host of the heavens."

Elsewhere reference to the "all the host of heaven" functions to demonstrate God's own power as creator (Neh. 9:6; Isa. 40:26; 45:12) or as a metaphor for an infinite number (Jer. 33:22 par. "sands of the sea"; cf. Gen. 15:5, which explicitly mentions the stars). According to Isa. 34:4, the skies will "roll up like a scroll" at the final catastrophe, and "all their host shall wither like a leaf withering on a vine" and fall to earth. Here the reference is clearly to the stars, as is doubtless also the case in Isa. 24:21, which predicts how Yahweh will punish *(pāqaḏ)* the host of heaven *(mārôm)* and the kings of the earth, alluding perhaps to their role as astral gods.[10] Although Dnl. 8:10 seems to distinguish between the "host of heaven" and the stars, the reference to "some of the stars" is more likely a gloss;[11] the male goat (the Persian Empire) "threw down to the earth some of the host" and trampled on them, a reference to the goat's arrogance.

On the other hand, the "host of heaven" can also refer to Yahweh's own court. Micaiah son of Imlah sees Yahweh sitting on his throne "with all the host of heaven standing beside him" (1 K. 22:19 par. 2 Ch. 18:18). Ps. 103:21 summons "all his [Yahweh's] hosts" to praise Yahweh; the previous verse mentions angels and *gibbôrîm,* and the parallel expression refers to "his ministers that do his will." Accordingly, the "prince of the host" must be Yahweh himself (Dnl. 8:11).

Finally Gen. 2:1 is noteworthy in this context, which tells how "the heavens and the earth were finished, and all their host." This passage is probably using an archaic expression to refer to what is otherwise generally called "all that is in it."

c. The term *ṣāḇā'* occurs with particular frequency in Nu. 31 in the meaning "military service." According to Nu. 1:3, *kol-yōṣē' ṣāḇā',* i.e., all men capable of military service, are to be enrolled. In connection with the war against Midian (Nu. 31), Moses tells the people to "arm some of your number for *ṣāḇā',* army service" (v. 3). Every tribe provides a thousand men for *ṣāḇā'* (army service, v. 4; NRSV "to the war"). The spoils are to be divided between the warriors who went out to battle *(hayyōṣ^e'îm*

10. See O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 13–39. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1974), 193-94.
11. L. F. Hartman and A. A. Di Lella, *Book of Daniel. AB* (1978), 225.

laṣṣāḇā') and the rest of the congregation (v. 27; cf. v. 36, *yōṣᵉ'îm baṣṣāḇā'*). The same chapter mentions *ḥᵃlûṣê ṣāḇā'*, "those who were armed for battle" (v. 5; cf. 32:27 and Josh. 4:13; 1 Ch. 12:24[23]; 2 Ch. 17:18), *'anšê haṣṣāḇā'* (v. 21), and *'am haṣṣāḇā'* (v. 32). The *ṣᵉḇā' milḥāmâ* is the military campaign itself from which the soldiers return (v. 14); comparable expressions include *'ālâ laṣṣāḇā'*, "go into battle" (Josh. 22:12). The expression *ṣᵉḇā' milḥāmâ* recurs in Isa. 13:4, where God himself musters the troops (cf. *gᵉḏûḏê ṣᵉḇā' milḥāmâ,* 1 Ch. 7:4; *kᵉlê ṣᵉḇā' milḥāmâ,* "weapons of war," 1 Ch. 12:38[37]).

d. The same meaning can be applied to other kinds of service. In 6 instances in Nu. 4, *ṣāḇā'* refers to the cultic service performed by the Levites in the tent of meeting (vv. 3,23,30,35,39,43; cf. 8:25, which refers to retirement from such service). The word expands semantically even further in its reference to human life as a *ṣāḇā'* in Job 7:1, where the parallel expression "days of a laborer" evokes the notion of compulsory labor or slavery. Job 14:14 can be understood similarly: "All the days of my service *(yᵉmê ṣᵉḇā'î)* I would wait until my release should come," where "release" *(ḥᵃlîpâ)* may also evoke the notion of military service. By contrast, 10:17 probably does not belong in this context; here *ḥᵃlîpôṯ wᵉṣāḇā'* probably refers to "troops that are constantly changing" rather than to "release and compulsory labor."[12]

The same meaning is generally also ascribed to Isa. 40:2, "that she has served her term of forced labor, that her penalty is paid," though the exile might also be understood here as severe military service or even as atoning cultic service. Dnl. 10:1 attests a further development of the term; here *ṣāḇā' gāḏôl* means approximately "great tribulation" (NRSV "conflict"). Although Dnl. 8:12-13 remains somewhat obscure, M. Buschhaus has suggested translating "and it [the horn] will give over for the *Tamid* a host in transgression."[13]

III. 1. *Qumran.* Among the Qumran occurrences, the Temple Scroll cites OT passages. 11QT 55:18 cites Dt. 17:3, and 58:10-11 picks up on Nu. 31:21-22. 11QT 62:5 mentions the commanders of the army.

The remaining occurrences also generally follow OT usage. The War Scroll stipulates that the leaders of the congregation are to arm soldiers for war except during the years of release (1QM 2:8), and that one standard is to bear the inscription "Host of God" (4:11). 1QM 5:3 refers to times "when their host has reached its full number." Military thinking also manifests itself in the community organization. 1QSa 1:6 addresses "the rule for all the hosts *(ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ)* of the congregation, and 1QSa 1:21 speaks about being "inscribed in the army register." Leaders, judges, and officers function "according to the number of all their hosts *(sᵉḇā'ôṯ)*" (1QSa 1:25). Finally, the *ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ* ("hosts") of human beings in the two genders also have a part in the ranks of the two spirits.

---

12. G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 158.

13. M. Buschhaus, "Traumpsychologisch-parapsychologische Bemerkungen zu drei Übersetzungsschwierigkeiten im Buch Daniel," *BN* 38/39 (1987) 28-29.

One hymnic section of the War Scroll mentions a "host of heavenly lights *(mᵉʾôrôṯ)*" together with clouds and winds (1QM 10:11-12); other passages refer to the "host of the angels of your [God's] holy abode" (12:1) and a book with the names "of all their host" (12:2). The "host of your elect" is mustered (v. 4), the angelic host is "among our numbered men" (v. 8; cf. 7:6, "holy angels shall be with their hosts"), and the "hosts of his spirits is with our foot soldiers and horsemen" (v. 9).

The Thanksgiving Hymns tell how one "may stand with the host of the Holy Ones" (1QH 3:22) or with the "everlasting host" (11:13). In connection with creation, one passage mentions the "host of your spirits" (13:8) and the "heavens and all their hosts and the earth and its host" (13:9). The "heavenly hosts" will cry out (3:35), and reference is even made to the "host of knowledge" (18:23). 4Q381 1:10 peculiarly mentions the *ṣāḇāʾ* together with all sorts of animals.

2. *LXX*. The translation of *ṣbʾ* in the LXX is wholly inconsistent. The noun is generally rendered as *dýnamis* or *stratiá*, though also as *parátaxis, pólemos, máchē*, and *leitourgía*. It is rendered in Job 7:1 and 10:17 as *peiratḗrion*, in Isa. 40:2 as *tapeívōsis*, and in Isa. 34:2 as *arithmós*. The LXX paraphrases and completely reinterprets the term in Job 14:14. The "host of heaven" is *ho kósmos, hē dýnamis*, or *hē stratiá toú ouranoú;* Isa. 34:4 and 45:12 follow the context in translating *ástra*. The expression *śar ṣāḇāʾ* is rendered as *archistrátēgos* or as *árchōn tḗs stratiás*. The variety of renderings is even greater for the verb, with only two verbs recurring more than once: *epistrateúō* (4 times) and *leitourgeín* (twice); other renderings include *energeín, paratássein*, and even *nēsteúein* in Ex. 38:8.

Ringgren

צְבָאוֹת *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ*

Contents: I. 1. Occurrences; 2. LXX; 3. Expressions; 4. Etymology and Grammatical Considerations; 5. Interpretations. II. Origin of the Designation *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ:* 1. Amos and Isaiah; 2. Jerusalem; 3. Shiloh. III. The Meaning of *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ:* 1. During the Early Period and at Shiloh; 2. In the Jerusalem Cult; 3. Narrative Literature; 4. Judean Prophecy; 5. Qumran, Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha. IV. Summary.

ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ. W. F. Albright, review of B. N. Wambacq, *L'épithète divine Jahvé Sᵉbaʾôt, JBL* 67 (1948) 377-81; idem, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan* (1968; repr. New York, 1969); A. Alt, "Gedanken über das Königtum Jahwes," *KlSchr*, I (³1964), 345-57; W. R. Arnold, *Ephod and Ark. HTS* 4 (1917), esp. 142-48; W. W. Graf Baudissin, *Kyrios*, II (1929), esp. 73-80; F. Baumgärtel, "Zu den Gottesnamen in den Büchern Jeremia und Ezechiel," *Verbannung und Heimkehr. FS W. Rudolph* (Tübingen, 1961), 1-29; O. Borchert, "Der Gottesname Jahve Zebaoth," *TSK* 69 (1896) 619-42; H. A. Brongers, "Der Eifer des Herrn Zebaoth," *VT* 13 (1963) 269-84; W. H. Brownlee, "The Ineffable Name of God," *BASOR* 226 (1977) 39-46; H. Cazelles,

I. 1. *Occurrences.* The noun *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ* is used exclusively as a divine epithet and occurs 285 times in the OT with the following distribution: 82 times in Jeremiah, 56 in

---

"Sabaot," *DBS*, X, 1123-27; P. C. Craigie, *The Problem of War in the OT* (Grand Rapids, 1978); J. L. Crenshaw, "*YHWH Ṣᵉbaʾôt Šᵉmô:* A Form-Critical Analysis," *ZAW* 81 (1969) 156-75; F. M. Cross, "Yahweh and the God of the Patriarchs," *HTR* 55 (1962) 255-59; idem, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic* (Cambridge, 1973), esp. 65-75; G. R. Driver, "Reflections on Recent Articles," *JBL* 73 (1954) 125-36; B. Duhm, *Israels Propheten. Lebensfragen* 26 (Tübingen, [2]1922); F. Dumermuth, "Zur deuteronomistischen Kulttheologie und ihren Voraussetzungen," *ZAW* 70 (1958) 59-98, esp. 70-79; W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the OT. OTL*, 2 vols. (Eng. trans. 1961-67), esp. I, 192-93; O. Eissfeldt, "Jahwe Zebaoth," *KlSchr*, III (1966), 103-23 = *Miscellanea Academica Berolinensia* (1950), II/2, 128-50; idem, "Silo und Jerusalem," *KlSchr*, III, 417-25 = *Volume du Congrès, Strasbourg 1956. SVT* 4 (1957), 138-47; J. A. Emerton, "New Light on Israelite Religion: The Implications of the Inscriptions from Kuntillet ʿAjrud," *ZAW* 94 (1982) 2-20, esp. 3ff.; G. Fohrer, *History of Israelite Religion* (Eng. trans. 1972); D. N. Freedman, "The Name of the God of Moses," *JBL* 79 (1960) 151-56; K. Galling, "Der Ehrenname Elisas und die Entrückung Elias," *ZTK* 53 (1956) 129-48; idem, "Die Ausrufung des Namens als Rechtsakt in Israel," *TLZ* 81 (1956) 65-70; I. Gefter, "Studies in the Use of *YHWH ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ* in Its Variant Forms" (diss., Brandeis, 1977); J. Hehn, *Die biblische und die babylonische Gottesidee* (Leipzig, 1913), esp. 250-58; H. D. Hummel, "Enclitic *Mem* in Early Northwest Semitic, Especially Hebrew," *JBL* 76 (1957) 85-107; A. Jeremias, *The OT in the Light of the Ancient East*, 2 vols. (Eng. trans. 1911), esp. II, 133-34; J. Jeremias, "Lade und Zion," *Probleme biblischer Theologie. FS G. von Rad* (Munich, 1971), 183-98; S. Johnson, "Sabaoth/Sabazios: A Curiosity in Ancient Religion," *Lexington Theological Quarterly* 13 (1978) 97-103; E. Kautzsch, "Zebaoth," *Real-Encyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche* 21 (1908) 620-27; W. Kessler, "Aus welchen Gründen wird die Bezeichnung 'Jahwe Zebaoth' in der späteren Zeit gemieden?" *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift Halle* 7 (1957/58) 767-71 = *Von Ugarit nach Qumran. FS O. Eissfeldt* (Berlin, 1958), 79-83; I. Kišš, "Zmysel formuly 'Jahve cebaót' a jej preklad," *Křesětanká revue* 41/5 (1974) 107-14; idem, "'The Lord of Hosts' or 'The Sovereign Lord of All'?" *BT* 26 (1975) 101-6; L. Köhler, *OT Theology* (Eng. trans. 1957), esp. 49-51; E. König, *Theologie des ATs* (Stuttgart, [4]1923), esp. 150-54; L. Kopf, "Arabische Etymologien und Parallelen zum Bibelwörterbuch," *VT* 8 (1958) 161-215, esp. 196; H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59* (Eng. trans. 1987), excursus 1, 81-89; M. Liverani, "La preistoria dell'epiteto '*Yahweh ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ*,'" *AION* 17 (1967) 331-34; M. Löhr, *Untersuchungen zum Buch Amos. BZAW* 4 (1901); V. Maag, "Jahwäs Heerscharen," *Kultur, Kulturkontakt und Religion: Gesammelte Studien* (Göttingen, 1980) 1-28 = *Schweizerische theologische Umschau* 20 (Bern, 1950) 27-52; J. Maier, *Das altisraelitische Ladeheiligtum. BZAW* 93 (1965), esp. 50-54; T. N. D. Mettinger, "Härskarornas Gud," *SEÅ* 44 (1979) 7-21; idem, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth: Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies. CBOT* 18 (1982); idem, "YHWH SABAOTH — The Heavenly King on the Cherubim Throne," in T. Ishida, ed., *Studies in the Period of David and Solomon and Other Essays* (Winona Lake, Ind., 1982), 109-38; P. D. Miller, *The Divine Warrior in Early Israel. HSM* 5 ([2]1975), esp. 145-55, 247-58; M. Noth, "Jerusalem and the Israelite Tradition," *The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Studies* (Eng. trans. 1966), 132-44; J. Obermann, "The Divine Name *YHWH* in the Light of Recent Discoveries," *JBL* 68 (1949) 301-23; M. Ottosson, "Tradition and History with Emphasis on the Composition of the Book of Joshua," in K. Jeppesen and B. Otzen, eds., *The Productions of Time* (Sheffield, 1984), 81-106, 141-43; G. von Rad, *Theology of the OT*, 2 vols. (Eng. trans. 1962-65), esp. I, 18-19 ; J. P. Ross, "Jahweh Ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ in Samuel and Psalms," *VT* 17 (1967) 76-92; F. Schicklberger, *Die Ladeerzählungen des ersten Samuel-Buches. FzB* 7 (1973); W. H. Schmidt, *Königtum Gottes in Ugarit und Israel. BZAW* 80 ([2]1966), esp. 89-90; R. Schmitt, *Zelt und Lade als Thema alttestamentlicher Wissenschaft* (Gütersloh, 1972), 145-59; J. Schreiner, *Sion-Jerusalem Jahwes Königssitz. Theologie der Heiligen Stadt im AT*

Proto-Isaiah, 53 in Zechariah, 24 in Malachi, 15 in Psalms, 14 in Haggai, 9 in Amos, 6 each in 2 Samuel and Deutero-Isaiah, 5 in 1 Samuel, 3 each in 1 Kings and 1 Chronicles, twice each in 2 Kings, Nahum, and Zephaniah, and once each in Hosea, Micah, and Habbakuk. A striking concentration of occurrences in Isaiah, Jeremiah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi stands over against the term's complete absence in the books from Genesis through Judges[1] as well as in Deuteronomy and in the more important parts of the Dtr History, in Ezekiel, Trito-Isaiah, and parts of late postexilic literature (e.g., 2 Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Daniel). Since the occurrences in 1/2 Kings are also associated with the prophets Elijah, Elisha, and Isaiah, nonprophetic witnesses are found only in the Psalms and in 1/2 Samuel (par. 1 Chronicles).

2. *LXX*. The LXX generally translates *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ* as *pantokrátōr* (ca. 120 times). In Jer. 5:14; 15:16; 23:16; 25:27; 31:34(35); 32:14; 33:11; 44:7; 50:34; 51:5,57, this translation constitutes an exception in that in the LXX, Jeremiah almost always (ca. 69 times) attests no equivalent for Heb. *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ*, and yet does indeed include *pantokrátōr* in passages where the MT has nothing (cf. 32:19). In 9 additional passages the LXX has no equivalent for the word (Isa. 3:15; 9:18[Eng. 19]; 14:23,27; 24:23; Am. 6:8; Zech. 1:3[bis]; 13:2), and in 15 passages it is only LXX variants that read *pantokrátōr, dynámeōn*, or *sabaṓth* (1 S. 4:4; Isa. 8:13; 9:12[13]; 10:23,26; 14:22; 19:17,18,20; 22:14; 31:5; Am. 6:14; Zech. 1:3; 8:3; 13:2). In Isaiah the LXX construes the word as a personal name and renders it as *sabaṓth* (ca. 42 times), similarly also in 1 S. 1:3,11; 15:2; 17:45; Jer. 46:10. The third understanding translates *yhwh (ʾᵉlōhê) ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ* as *kýrios (ho theós) tṓn dynámeōn* in 2 S. 6:2,18; 1 K. 18:15; 2 K. 3:14; 19:31; Jer. 33:12; Zeph. 2:9; Zech. 7:4, and exclusively in the Psalms. Eissfeldt suggests that this translation was introduced secondarily into the LXX from Theodotion's translation by way of Origen's Hexapla.[2]

The concentration of particular translation variants in certain biblical books

---

(Munich, 1963); F. Schwally, *Der heilige Krieg im alten Israel. Semitische Kriegsaltertümer* 1 (Leipzig, 1901); R. Smend, *Lehrbuch der alttestamentlichen Religionsgeschichte* (Freiburg, [2]1899), esp. 201-4; R. Smend Jr., *Yahweh War and Tribal Confederation* (Eng. trans. 1970), esp. 81-83; F. Stolz, *Jahwes und Israels Kriege. ATANT* 60 (1972), esp. 45ff.; A. Strikovsky, "Hashem Ṣevaot in the Bible" (Heb.; diss., New York, 1970); M. Tsevat, "Studies in the Book of Samuel," *HUCA* 36 (1965) 49-58; idem, *The Meaning of the Book of Job and Other Biblical Studies* (New York, 1980); R. de Vaux, "Les chérubins et l'arche d'alliance, les sphinx gardiens et les trônes divins dans l'ancien Orient," *Bible et Orient. Cogitatio fidei* 24 (Paris, 1967), 231-59 = *MUSJ* 37 (1960/61), 91-124; idem, *AncIsr*, indices s.v. "Yahweh-Sabaoth"; T. C. Vriezen, *Outline of OT Theology* (Eng. trans. [2]1970); B. N. Wambacq, *Lépithète divine Jahvé Sᵉbaʾôt* (Brugge, 1947); G. Wanke, *Die Zionstheologie der Korachiten. BZAW* 97 (1966), esp. 40-46; M. Weinfeld, "'They Fought from Heaven' — Divine Intervention in War in Ancient Israel and in the Ancient Near East," *FS H. L. Ginsberg. ErIsr* 14 (1978), 23-30; J. Wellhausen, *Die kleinen Propheten* (Berlin, [4]1963), esp. 77; A. S. van der Woude, "צָבָא *ṣāḇāʾ* army," *TLOT*, II, 1039-46; W. Zimmerli, *OT Theology in Outline* (Eng. trans. 1978), esp. 75-76.

1. Concerning the absence of the term in the Pentateuch, see A. Jeremias, II, 134; and more recently Eissfeldt, *KlSchr*, III, 113.

2. Eissfeldt, *KlSchr*, III, 105 n. 1.

(*dýnamis* in the Psalms, *sabaṓth* in Isaiah, *pantokrátōr* in the remaining prophetic writings) derives less from semantic variations than from variations in language use among the translators, also suggesting that the LXX originally rendered it either as "the Lord Almighty" or "the Lord of Power." It is doubtful, however, that this situation reveals the "various stages of language use."[3] The most important point is that even the LXX translation already attests a plethora of renderings of *ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ* as a personal name and as an appellative in both the singular and plural as well as a consideration of several different grammatical explanations of the expression Yahweh *ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ* as a construct phrase and as an attribute to a personal name.[4]

3. *Expressions.* The divine epithet *ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ* is never used alone. The following expressions occur with the following frequency: *yhwh ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ* (240 times), *'ᵃḏōnāy yhwh ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ* (15 times), *yhwh 'ᵉlōhê ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ* (14 times), *hā'āḏôn yhwh ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ* (5 times), *yhwh 'ᵉlōhîm ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ* (4 times), *'ᵉlōhê ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ* and *yhwh 'ᵉlōhê haṣṣᵉḇā'ôṯ* (twice each), and *'ᵃḏōnāy yhwh haṣṣᵉḇā'ôṯ, 'ᵃḏōnāy yhwh 'ᵉlōhê haṣṣᵉḇā'ôṯ,* and *yhwh 'ᵉlōhê ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ 'ᵃḏōnāy* (once each). Because the expressions *yhwh 'ᵉlōhîm ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ* (Ps. 59:6[5]; 80:5,20[4,19]; 84:9[8]) and *'ᵉlōhîm ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ* (80:8,15[7,14]) occur exclusively in the Elohist psalter and constitute a secondary replacement for an original *yhwh ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ*,[5] one should probably view *yhwh ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ* as the primary expression, particularly since it is both the shortest and most frequently attested.[6]

4. *Etymology and Grammatical Considerations.* Grammatically the term *ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ* is the feminine plural of the noun → צבא *ṣāḇā'*, "army, host." Because this noun uses both a masculine and a feminine plural form, one can indeed associate *ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ* with this noun;[7] at the same time, one must pay attention to the semantic distinction between the different plural constructions.[8] The only OT passage offering an explanation of *ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ* is the discourse David delivers to Goliath: "You come to me with sword and spear and javelin; but I come to you in the name of Yahweh *ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ,* the God of the armies *(ma'arḵôṯ)* of Israel" (1 S. 17:45). Even though one cannot determine whether this expression is a gloss,[9] it is clear that the passage interprets *ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ* as "army host" based on popular etymology.[10] Scholars no longer assume, as did Buber,[11] that this expres-

---

3. Kautzsch, 626.
4. See Eissfeldt, *KlSchr,* III, 105.
5. *GK,* §125h.
6. Supporters of the shorter form include *GK,* §125h; Kautzsch, 621; Duhm, 64; Wambacq, 100; von Rad, I, 19; Tsevat, 50-51; H. J. Stoebe, *Das erste Buch Samuelis. KAT* VIII/1 (1973), 90; H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12* (Eng. trans. 1991), 29-30; Mettinger, *Studies,* 127; supporters of the longer form include Smend, *Lehrbuch,* 203; König, 150; Köhler, 50; Maag, *Kultur,* 2-3; undecided scholars include Eissfeldt, *KlSchr,* III, 106-7; van der Woude, 1043-44.
7. See Ross, 89.
8. See Michel, 46.
9. Smend, *Lehrbuch,* 202-3.
10. Ross, 89.
11. M. Buber, *Kingship of God* (Eng. trans. 1967), 102-4.

sion was part of ancient tradition[12] even if references to Dtn name theology[13] prove little, since neither Deuteronomy nor the Dtr History uses the epithet *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ* in the first place.

The same passage can be adduced as an example of the expression Yahweh *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ* understood as a genitive construction as presupposed by the LXX translation *kýrios tṓn dynámeōn*. Following G. R. Driver's reference to *GK*, §125h, scholars have tended to accept this grammatical explanation even though König and, more recently, Maag and Tsevat have challenged it, while Mettinger finds the explanation to be the one with fewest problems and Eissfeldt suggests that it at least not be excluded.[14]

One might also understand *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ* as a personal name or construe the expression as a nominal clause: "Yahweh is *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ*."[15] A more attractive possibility is to understand the position of *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ* with relationship to Yahweh as that of an attribute or an apposition.[16] The verbal explanation as "He (who) creates the (heavenly) armies" suggested by Cross[17] is suspect not least because of its arbitrary interpretation of the name Yahweh.[18] Given this interpretation of the expression Yahweh *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ*, the suggestions of Vriezen and Eissfeldt deserve serious consideration according to which *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ* functions as a plural of intensity[19] or, better, as an intensive abstract plural,[20] even though Brockelmann has objected that Eissfeldt equates the abstract plural with the concrete plural.[21] Finally, Maier's suggestion is erroneous that *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ* represents the dual of the concrete noun in reference to the two armies of Israel and Judah.[22]

5. *Interpretations.* Given the complications attaching to any attempt to provide a universally acceptable explanation of *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ*, it seems advisable to preface the following discussion with a survey of previously suggested explanations.

As we have already seen, the OT itself interprets *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ* as a reference to Israel's army in 1 S. 17:45, suggesting that Yahweh was himself understood as a God of war, an interpretation supported by Schwally with references to the ark and adopted by

---

12. Dissenters emerged as early as Smend, *Lehrbuch*, 202; again Eichrodt, I, 192 n. 8; Smend Jr., *Yahweh War*, 82-83; Ross, 82.

13. Stoebe, *Samuelis*, 332, 338; Stolz, 141-42.

14. König, 150; Maag, *Kultur*, 2-3; Tsevat, 51-55; Mettinger, *Studies*, 128; Eissfeldt, *KlSchr*, III, 106.

15. Tsevat, 54-55.

16. Attribute: Vriezen, 125; von Rad, I, 19; Wanke, 44 n. 16; Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12*, 29-30; van der Woude, 1043; apposition: Tsevat.

17. Cf. Freedman, 156; Brownlee.

18. De Vaux, *AncIsr*, 259.

19. Vriezen, 124-25.

20. Eissfeldt, *KlSchr*, III, 110-13; other supporters include von Rad, I, 19; Galling, "Ehrenname," 145-46; Wanke, 43.

21. *Synt*, 16 n. 1; see also Eichrodt, I, 193 n. 2.

22. Maier, 51.

later scholars as well.[23] Several considerations militate against this interpretation. First, the title *ṣeḇāʼôṯ* does not appear in connection with Yahweh's wars.[24] Second, because it became associated with the ark only secondarily, it should not be interpreted in that context. Finally, the use of *ṣeḇāʼôṯ* in prophecy runs counter to this interpretation.[25]

The second suggestion evokes the notion of the heavenly armies or hosts[26] and thus understands Yahweh as the commander of the stars[27] or of the heavenly council,[28] simply as the celestial God as such,[29] or as the Lord of the angelic hosts.[30] Dissenting scholars point out that the understanding of angels in the OT is poorly developed,[31] that the heavenly host is mentioned only in the singular or in the masculine plural,[32] and that the function of a leader or "chair" of the heavenly council would more likely bear the title *ʽelyôn*.[33] Tsevat thus suggests translating *ṣeḇāʼôṯ* as "armies" and the expression itself as "Yahweh (Is) Armies."[34] This interpretation, however, is then generalized and understood so broadly that it loses its specific character and merges with other interpretations.

Maag presents a third alternative by understanding *ṣeḇāʼôṯ* as the "diminished mythical Canaanite powers of nature."[35] The problem attaching to this view is that the OT itself nowhere provides evidence of the process in which such diminution took place.

The next alternatives are all inclined to interpret the term extremely broadly. Smend interprets *ṣeḇāʼôṯ* as the "ruler of all the powers of the world." According to Wellhausen, it "probably refers to the world and all that is in it, perhaps even to the host or army of demons." For Eichrodt *ṣeḇāʼôṯ* is the "quintessence of all earthly and heavenly beings." Vriezen similarly finds in it a reference to "all the powers in heaven and on earth." Finally Eissfeldt understands *ṣeḇāʼôṯ* as a reference to Yahweh's omnipotence.[36] Although these suggestions all are supported by the presence of *pantokrátōr* in the LXX, such support can also be a liability.

---

23. See Kautzsch, 622-23; supporters include König, 151-52; Freedman, 156; Smend Jr., *Yahweh War*, 82-83; Stolz, 45ff.; J. Jeremias, 188.

24. Köhler, 32-33; Ross, 79.

25. Von Rad, I, 19.

26. See also G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Jesaja. ZBK* 19/1 (1960), 43, 100; Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12*, 29-30; O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 1–12. OTL* (Eng. trans. ²1983), 126-27.

27. Köhler, 33; similarly already A. Jeremias, II, 133.

28. Mettinger, *Studies*, 123-26.

29. Duhm, 64.

30. So, e.g., Cross, "Yahweh and the God of the Patriarchs," 255ff.; Freedman and Willoughby, → מלאך *malʼāḵ*, VIII, 322.

31. Köhler, 33.

32. Kautzsch, 622.

33. See Mettinger, *Studies*, 134, who views *ʽelyōn* and *ṣeḇāʼôṯ* as "twin titles."

34. Tsevat, 55-57.

35. Maag, *Kultur*, 26; cf. 17-18; cf. also Schicklberger, 27.

36. Smend, *Lehrbuch*, 202; Wellhausen, 77; Eichrodt, I, 193 n. 2; Vriezen, 124-25; Eissfeldt, *KlSchr*, III, 110-13; with Eissfeldt also Galling, "Ehrenname," 145-46; Ross, 80ff.; van der Woude, 1045: "a predicate of royal dominion."

Finally, one can try to avoid such difficulties by adducing a semantic development[37] or by doing without an explanation altogether.[38]

II. Origin of the Designation *ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ*.

1. *Amos and Isaiah.* The point of departure for the development of this term is found among the early-eighth-century prophets Amos and Isaiah. Because Isaiah uses the term *ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ* so frequently, Brongers has suggested that he was the first to introduce it, a notion scholars as early as Alt already debated.[39] The only accurate information in this view is that Isaiah did indeed understand this epithet as a reference to Yahweh's comprehensive power.[40]

By contrast, Wellhausen (followed only by Smend[41]) believed that Amos coined the title *ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ* and that the occurrences in Samuel and Kings represented later addenda. This suggestion is less persuasive because the occurrences in Amos probably represent redactional insertions themselves.

2. *Jerusalem.* In view of the occurrences in the songs of Zion in the Psalms and in Isaiah, hardly any scholars today challenge the view that the epithet *ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ* derives from the Jerusalem cult of Yahweh. The only question is whether the term became associated in Jerusalem with the God of Israel who entered the city with the ark[42] and thus might even derive from venerable Jebusite tradition, or whether it came to Jerusalem from Shiloh as a title already associated with Yahweh as the God of the ark. Because scholars have occasionally suggested that the title also associated with Yahweh and the ark in Shiloh, namely, "who is enthroned on the cherubim" (1 S. 4:4; 2 S. 6:2), can "hardly be understood other than as a projection back of the conditions of the Solomonic temple,"[43] one might also consider whether the designation *ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ* was not also analogously projected back to Shiloh. Such a finding would also, of course, provide an important clue supporting the term's origin in Jerusalem.

Unfortunately, this analogous conclusion is unfounded because the association of *ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ* and cherubim throne attested in Shiloh is not attested in the language of the Jerusalem cult; rather, the title "who is enthroned on the cherubim" occurs without *ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ*, e.g., in Hezekiah's prayer to "Yahweh the God of Israel, who is enthroned above the cherubim" (2 K. 19:15; differently Isa. 37:16, "Yahweh *ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ*, God of Is-

---

37. Already Kautzsch, 625-26; König, 153-54; more recently Wambacq; Schreiner, 29, 189; Maier, 51-53; Fohrer, *History*, 159-60.

38. Von Rad, I, 18-19; Wanke, 43; Smend Jr., *Yahweh War*, 60-61; similarly also F. Stolz, *Das erste und zweite Buch Samuel. ZBK* 9 (1981), 214.

39. H. A. Brongers, *De scheppingstradities bij de Profeten* (Amsterdam, 1945), 117-18; Alt, 350.

40. So, correctly, Vriezen, 125 n. 1.

41. Smend, *Lehrbuch*, 203-4.

42. Galling, "Ehrenname," 145; Fohrer, *Jesaja*, 99.

43. Smend Jr., *Yahweh War*, 81; Maier, 53-55, is even more confident; also M. Görg, → ישׁב *yāšaḇ*, VI, 434-36.

rael, who is enthroned above the cherubim"), in 1 Ch. 13:6, or in Ps. 99:1.[44] Ps. 80:2(1) is an exception in that *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ* also occurs 4 times in this psalm, which can only be explained as a title that was originally associated with "you who are enthroned upon the cherubim." One solution is to assume that Ps. 80 actually originated in northern Israel,[45] suggesting that as far as the Jerusalem cult is concerned, one must deal with each title separately. In that case, however, there is no longer any compelling reason to contest the origin of the epithet *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ* in Shiloh.

3. *Shiloh.* It is doubtless no accident that in the OT tradition the name *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ* is attested first in 1 S. 1:3,11, and 4:4. In both passages the designation Yahweh *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ* is associated with Shiloh and its temple. The first recounts how Elkanah went up each year to worship Yahweh *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ* in Shiloh; Hannah's prayer in the Shiloh temple similarly begins by addressing Yahweh *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ* (1:11). The "ark of the covenant of Yahweh *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ* who is enthroned on the cherubim" is summoned from Shiloh and plays a special role in Israel's ultimately unsuccessful war against the Philistines (4:4). When David brings up the ark from Baale-judah, the full title appears yet a second time and now reads: "the ark of God, which is called by the name of Yahweh *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ* who is enthroned on the cherubim" (2 S. 6:2). Because this name is already attested in Shiloh, it was probably not applied to the ark for the first time only in Baale-judah.[46] Stoebe's assertion that the name Yahweh *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ* almost certainly originated in Shiloh and in intimate association with the ark constitutes the present consensus.[47] Because the title *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ* is not attested in the ark tradition predating the Shiloh period, it probably first became associated with the ark in Shiloh.[48]

One remaining question that can probably never be answered unequivocally is whether the title is of Israelite[49] or Canaanite origin. One can note in this regard that as far as we know, it was in Shiloh that the ark was first housed in what was, after all, probably a former Canaanite temple; this consideration together with the reference in 2 S. 6:2[50] to the ceremonious legal act[51] of renaming or adding to the name of the God of the ark *yhwh* rather suggests that the title *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ* represents a divine designation that had already long been familiar in Shiloh[52] and was now transferred to the

---

44. See J. Jeremias, 188 n. 18.

45. Most recently Ottosson, 97.

46. Stolz, *Samuel,* 214.

47. Maag, *Kultur,* 6; Eissfeldt, *KlSchr,* III, 113-16; idem, *KlSchr,* III, 421; idem, → אדון *ʾāḏôn (ʾādhôn),* I, 70-71; von Rad, I, 18-19; de Vaux, "Les chérubins," 258-59; *AncIsr,* 259; Schreiner, 29; Smend Jr., *Yahweh War,* 81; Schmidt, 89-90; Wanke, 41; Ross, 79; Crenshaw, 167; J. Jeremias, 188; Zimmerli, 75; H. D. Preuss, → את *ʾēṯ (ʾēth),* I, 458-59; van der Woude, 1045; H.-J. Fabry, → כסא *kissēʾ,* VII, 253; Mettinger, *Studies,* 128.

48. A different view is taken by Fohrer, *History,* 98.

49. So van der Woude, 1045; Mettinger, *Studies,* 134-35.

50. Concerning this text, see I. L. Seeligmann, "Indications of Editorial Alteration and Adaptation in the Massoretic Text and the Septuagint," *VT* 11 (1961) 204-5.

51. Already Kautzsch, 623; again Noth, 142; emphatically Galling, "Ehrenname," 81; also Eissfeldt, *KlSchr,* III, 422 n. 1; Zimmerli, 75-76.

52. A different view is taken by Wanke, 41.

new Lord of the temple. De Vaux correctly understands 2 S. 6:2 as the legitimation of this process,[53] and Maag correctly identifies the expansion of the name as an indication of a dispute between the Yahweh religion and the indigenous faith.[54] Finally one must note that we are familiar with these titles in the first place only because they were of significance to the authors and tradents of what is known as the ark narrative. According to L. Rost, however, their interest in the title was clearly of a priestly-cultic nature.[55]

Hence a precise understanding of the content of *ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ* can also draw on whatever details emerge regarding the second title, "who is enthroned on the cherubim." That this title derives from the the Canaanite sphere and indeed from Shiloh itself[56] seems cogent not least because such cherubim were indeed at home in the Canaanite cult and culture[57] and did not function as throne bearers in the Solomonic temple in any event. If such is indeed the case, then the obvious conclusion is that the title "who is enthroned on the cherubim" belonged *eo ipso* together with the title *ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ* in Shiloh.[58] That the two titles no longer appear together in the Jerusalem cultic tradition does not constitute a counterargument, since given the different function of the cherubim there, namely, as guardians or protectors of the ark, one could now hardly speak of Yahweh "who is enthroned on the cherubim" in this direct fashion.[59]

As far as content is concerned, the epithet "who is enthroned on the cherubim" contains an unmistakable reference to divine kingship.[60] The God who is enthroned is venerated as king. If this assertion does indeed apply to Shiloh's sanctuary, then one can hardly avoid concluding that the cultic inventory of the temple there also included a cherubim throne. Because "*ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ* who is enthroned on the cherubim" is the new name of Yahweh as the God of the ark, then in Shiloh "the throne idea became associated with the ark."[61] De Vaux has suggested that the two cultic objects, the throne and ark, might have been associated such that "the cherubim seat and the ark step together constituted Yahweh's throne."[62] The final question involves with which god was Yahweh identified in Shiloh. Although Ross suggests Baʻal on the basis of alleged connections with the Canaanite fertility cult, no such connections are associated with the title *ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ*.[63] Other scholars have suggested El,[64] since the title "who is enthroned on the

53. "Les chérubins," 259.

54. Maag, *Kultur,* 6ff.

55. *Das kleine Credo und andere Studien zum AT* (Heidelberg, 1965), 151-52.

56. Stoebe, *Samuelis,* 158.

57. De Vaux, "Les chérubins," 234-52.

58. Eissfeldt, *KlSchr,* III, 116-19; de Vaux, "Les chérubins," 231-32; J. Jeremias, 187; Mettinger, *Studies,* 128-34.

59. Zimmerli, 76.

60. So Ross, 80; J. Jeremias, 198.

61. H.-J. Fabry, → כסא *kissēʼ,* VII, 253.

62. "Les chérubins," 258.

63. Ross, 79, 89-90.

64. De Vaux, "Les chérubins," 259; Clements (cited in Ross, 90 n. 1); cf. also van der Woude, 1045.

cherubim" and the notion of the enthroned king fit El rather than Baʻal.[65] El is predicated as king in Ugarit and portrayed sitting on a throne "as implying a static presence,"[66] whereas Baʻal represents the powerful and dynamic god in heaven for whom the title *rkb ʻrpt*, "rider of clouds," is far more appropriate. In this case, however, the designation *ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ* might also derive from the cult surrounding El, and the postulated expression *ʼēl ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ* could then resolve the grammatical problems attaching to the expression Yahweh *ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ*.[67]

The high number of occurrences in other postexilic prophets makes it difficult to determine whether the derivation of the epithet *ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ* from Canaanite religion also explains why Hosea (the only occurrence in Hosea derives from Judean redactors), Deuteronomy, and especially Ezekiel avoid the title, namely, because "the expression Yahweh *ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ* still recalled integrated numinous powers and perhaps also pagan gods."[68]

III. The Meaning of *ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ*.

1. *During the Early Period and at Shiloh.* Eissfeldt places considerable emphasis on the assertion that the Yahweh religion reached a "higher stage" in Shiloh;[69] this new quality also came to expression externally in the expansion of Yahweh's name by the title "*ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ* who is enthroned on the cherubim." Hence "Yahweh *ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ* who is enthroned on the cherubim" is related to Yahweh as Yahweh is to El Shaddai (Ex. 6:2-3).[70] These findings provide the necessary presuppositions for answering the question of the content of *ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ* during the early period of Israelite religion. Methodologically one must note that because this name was added to Yahweh as God of the ark, its interpretation may not take the ark as its primary point of departure[71] even if that title certainly also contains elements that describe Yahweh as God of the ark. Because the ark is generally associated with war and is thus often described as a palladium in war, we must for the moment leave such notions in abeyance. It then seems advisable to ascribe those elements to the title *ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ* that from the outset have nothing to do with the ark itself, in this case, elements associated with what one would call the "royal" sphere.

Alt already suggested that the ark, the special designation Yahweh *ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ*, and the royal title belonged together long before Isaiah.[72] Ross suggested the formulation "the power of Yahweh Ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ is royal," and van der Woude agrees that the title *ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ* "is a predicate of royal dominion."[73] Zimmerli does not depart from the above when he

---

65. D. N. Freedman and M. P. O'Connor, → כרוב *kᵉrûḇ*, VII, 314; Mettinger, *Studies*, 128, 134.

66. M. Görg, → ישב *yāšaḇ*, VI, 435.

67. Mettinger, *Studies*, 134-35.

68. Kessler, 770; cf. already Smend, *Lehrbuch*, 204.

69. Eissfeldt, *KlSchr*, III, 421.

70. Ibid., 422.

71. So, correctly, Smend Jr., *Yahweh War*, 81; a different view is taken by Eichrodt, I, 192; and Stoebe, *Samuelis*, 95.

72. Alt, 350.

73. Ross, 80; van der Woude, 1045.

translates the title as the "mighty one,"[74] since in all these interpretations the new title's content is more comprehensive and includes all the ideas associated with the God of the ark as a presence in war. Eissfeldt is quite correct that the new stage of the Yahweh religion as expressed by the title *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ* differs from the earlier stage by enormously expanding Yahweh's power and majesty, and that it is precisely the title *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ* that brings that power and majesty to expression.[75] In the relationship between *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ* and the ark, Yahweh's royal majesty includes, among other things, also the notion of the wars of Yahweh even though that notion by no means defines the enthroned king.[76] In this regard it is worth noting that the Yahweh temple in Shiloh, as was later the case only in Jerusalem, is called → היכל *hêḵāl* (1 S. 1:9; 3:3). That this term refers "primarily to royal palaces" confirms the present interpretation of *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ*.[77]

2. *In the Jerusalem Cult.* When the ark was brought to Jerusalem, its associated traditions and divine predicates were also brought to the city of David, where they merged with Yahweh and his temple in the new capital. Although the details of this transition are obscure, Yahweh *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ* had become the cultic name of the God of Israel in Shiloh and was now also the title of this same God in Jerusalem. The epithet was and remained cultic. Its connection with the ark was so strong that this predicate accompanied the ark to Jerusalem and into the temple, where, however, it quickly dissociated from the ark and was thus not affected by the ark's own diminishing significance.

The elevated language of prayer in Shiloh also included *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ* as Yahweh's cultic name (1 S. 1:3,11); and once the ark itself was brought to Jerusalem, David not only functioned as a cultic official, but he also ultimately blessed the people like a priest "in the name of Yahweh *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ*" (2 S. 6:18).

The Psalms offer the following formal and substantive information. Among the eight psalms that use *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ*, four are hymns (Ps. 46; 48; 84; 89), three are laments (Ps. 59; 69; 80), and the last part of Ps. 24 is perhaps a cultic song. Hence not surprisingly, 10 of the 15 occurrences in the Psalms are found in the address portions, both in the lament (59:6[5]; 69:7[6]; 80:5,8,15,20[4,7,14,19]; cf. also 1 S. 1:11) and in the hymn (Ps. 84:2,4,9,13[1,3,8,12]), usage doubtless reflecting the language of the Jerusalem cult. On the other hand, the title *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ* was probably not part of the Jerusalem cultic tradition itself,[78] since in that case one would expect to find more occurrences in the Psalms (of the 31 occurrences of → עליון *ʿelyôn* in the OT, 21 are in the Psalter[79]).

The parallel designation to Yahweh *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ* is "the God of Jacob" in Ps. 46:8,12(7,11); 84:9(8), and "the God of Israel" in 69:7(6). Both parallels reflect northern Israelite tradition and thus support the suggestion that the title Yahweh *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ* orig-

---

74. Zimmerli, 75 ("mighty one"); similarly Schreiner, 189; Stolz, *Samuel,* 214.
75. *KlSchr,* III, 422.
76. See J. Jeremias, 187-88.
77. M. Ottosson, → היכל *hêḵāl (hêkhāl),* III, 383. Also Schmidt, 90.
78. Cf. Wanke, 41-42, 44; Kessler, 767; Stolz, *Samuel,* 214.
79. Wanke, 46.

inated in Shiloh.[80] Ps. 84:4(3) also uses an expression deriving from the sphere of personal piety, "my King and my God," in which the royal predicate can either be merely fortuitous or based on a general understanding of Yahweh's kingship. Such is hardly the case in Ps. 24, however, since the section asking "who is this King of glory?" emphatically answers "Yahweh *ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ*, he is the King of glory" (v. 10), though v. 8 does also respond "Yahweh, strong and mighty," and "Yahweh, mighty in battle." The allusion to the wars of Yahweh and thence also to the ark is unmistakable, at least in the second expression. The ark tradition also includes the concept of *kāḇôḏ*, as illustrated by the naming of the son of Eli's daughter-in-law as "Ichabod" (1 S. 4:21) and the name's explication as "the glory has departed from Israel," because the ark of God had been captured. Does this explanation also provide information about the "meaning of the title" *ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ*?[81] Although allusions to the ark and to holy war might suggest as much,[82] the ark's association with war does not also cover the title "king." This situation does, however, reveal the specific meaning of *ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ*, since the poet of Ps. 24 is concerned not with the God who conducts Israel's wars, the God who is Israel's God of war,[83] but with the "King of glory" who enters and from now on resides in Jerusalem and its temple.[84]

This context easily accommodates references to the divine presence of Yahweh *ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ* in Jerusalem and on Zion. Ps. 48:9(8) calls Jerusalem the "city of Yahweh *ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ* (though cf. *BHS*). Here is where one finds his "lovely dwelling place" (84:2[1]) and his altars (84:4[3]). As Yahweh *ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ*, he is incomparable among the heavenly beings (89:7,9[6,8]), something both history and creation illustrate well (vv. 10ff.[9ff.]). He heads the council of the holy ones (v. 8[7]) as the highest God, indeed as the heavenly king (juxtaposed with the earthly king?).[85] Thus the psalmist expresses his trust in constant protection and succor in the refrain, "Yahweh *ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ* is with us,[86] the God of Jacob is our fortress" (46:[4],8,12[(3),7,11]). All these elements are witnesses to Jerusalem theology and temple piety.[87]

This particular understanding of faith also serves as the foundation for petitions to Yahweh *ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ* for assistance and help. Such petitions entreat him to "hear my prayer" (Ps. 84:9[8]), to spare those from shame who hope in him (69:7[6]), and to "awake to punish all the nations" (59:6[5]). If Ps. 80 is of northern Israelite provenance,[88] we see that here too the divine name Yahweh *ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ* was embraced. Here Joseph (v. 2[1]), i.e., Ephraim, Benjamin, and Manasseh (v. 3[2]), entreat him as the "Shepherd of Israel" and

---

80. See H. D. Preuss, "Ich will mit dir sein," *ZAW* 80 (1968) 151; → את *'ēṯ ('ēth)*, I, 458-59.
81. Smend Jr., *Yahweh War*, 83.
82. Wanke, 44; J. Jeremias, 188.
83. Cf. Schreiner, 189; H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59* (Eng. trans. 1987), 316.
84. See Mettinger, *Studies*, 112-23; a different view is taken by Ross, 88.
85. Mettinger, *Studies*, 135-38.
86. Schreiner, 225, understands the verse as a reference to the Davidic covenant; Preuss, "Ich will mit dir sein," 159, as a typical expression of faith; and J. Jeremias, 194-95, as a reference to holy war.
87. Cf. Schreiner, 189; Stolz, *Samuel*, 214.
88. Most recently Ottosson, 97.

as "you who are enthroned upon the cherubim" (v. 2[1]) to "give ear" and "shine forth," to cease being "angry" with his people (v. 5[4]), and rather to "turn again" (v. 15[14]), "look down from heaven" (v. 15[14]), let his face "shine," "help" and "restore" his people (vv. 4,8,20[3,7,19]). It is noteworthy that this psalm uses the term *ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ* as a personal name (so Ottosson) in loose association with the title "you who are enthroned upon the cherubim," which in its own turn carries forward ancient Israelite-Shilonite traditions[89] possibly disclosing certain differences over against the Jerusalem cult.

3. *Narrative Literature.* Given the high estimation accorded the Zion temple as the locus of divine presence, it comes as no surprise that the Jerusalem theology also exerted an enduring influence on all other areas of Israel's spiritual and literary life as well.[90] In addition to the passages from 1/2 Samuel already discussed, the title "Yahweh *ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ*" also makes an emphatic statement in 2 S. 5:10: "And David became greater and greater, for Yahweh, the God *ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ*, was with him" (par. 1 Ch. 11:9). Here we encounter the "leitmotif"[91] of the accession narrative. The same impulse is at work when the author has David direct his prayer to "Yahweh *ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ*" (2 S. 7:26 par. 1 Ch. 17:24). As Yahweh *ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ*, Jerusalem's God possesses royal dignity and power and as such is the divine counterpart to the Davidic kingship.

Such influence is attested even more broadly in prophecy. In any event, the messenger formula "thus says Yahweh *ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ*" as uttered by Samuel (1 S. 15:2) and Nathan (2 S. 7:8 par. 1 Ch. 17:7) clearly derives from prophetic rather than from Dtr influence.[92] The occurrences of *ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ* in the Elijah-Elisha stories (1 K. 18:15; 19:10,14; 2 K. 3:14) can be assessed similarly, since they, like the only occurrence in Hosea, quite possibly derive from Judean redactors.[93]

4. *Judean Prophecy.* One particularly striking feature is the large number of occurrences of *ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ* in Judean prophecy and its absence in the only prophet from the northern kingdom, Hosea (Hos. 12:6[5] is a later insertion[94]), suggesting that at least during the middle period of the monarchy the title *ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ* was either not used in northern Israel or had fallen into disuse, in which case, however, the path of tradition to Isaiah and Amos can hardly have proceeded by way of Elijah-Elisha.[95] This situation again more likely reflects the enduring influence of the Jerusalem cult.[96]

---

89. See Ross, 85-86.

90. See Noth, 139-40.

91. Stolz, *Samuel,* 207.

92. Stoebe, *Samuelis,* 279; Stolz, *Samuel,* 99-100.

93. Cf. E. Würthwein, *Die Bücher der Könige,* part II: *1. Kön. 17–2. Kön. 25. ATD* XI/2 (1984), 286-87; G. Hentschel, *Könige. NEB* 10 (1984/85), 117-18; Stolz, *Samuel,* 214; Dumermuth, 72 n. 70; T. Naumann, "Die Strukturen der Nachinterpretation in Hosea 4–14" (diss., Halle, 1987), 127-36.

94. Dumermuth, 72 n. 69; H. W. Wolff, *Hosea. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1974), 213; J. Jeremias, *Der Prophet Hosea. ATD* XXIV/1 (1983), 154; *BHS.*

95. So Ross, 91; cf. also van der Woude, 1045.

96. Stolz, *Samuel,* 214; a different view is taken by Wanke, 42-43, 46.

Before examining the questions of content raised by the prophetic use of *ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ*, let us first enumerate the various formulas in which the term is used. The term *ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ* occurs within the messenger formula "thus says Yahweh" twice in Isaiah, once in Amos, 54 times in Jeremiah, once in Deutero-Isaiah, 18 times in Zechariah, 5 times in Haggai, and once in Malachi. The divine discourse formula "utterance of Yahweh" occurs 7 times in Isaiah, 3 in Amos, 11 in Jeremiah, 10 in Zechariah, and 6 in Haggai. The formula "says *('āmar)* Yahweh" is expanded with *ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ* once in Amos, twice in Nahum, once in Zephaniah, once in Deutero-Isaiah, twice in Haggai, 4 times in Zechariah, and 20 times in Malachi. Since the few *ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ* translations in the LXX do not or do not yet reflect the considerable increase of expanded formulas in Jeremiah,[97] we are dealing here with late postexilic accommodation; Jeremiah is in any event inclined to use plerophorical expressions, and indeed uses the longest formula, "thus says Yahweh, the God *ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ*, the God of Israel," in three different passages (Jer. 35:17; 38:17; 44:7). This survey reveals that the postexilic prophets were increasingly inclined to engage in epigonic imitation of the preexilic prophets,[98] thus demonstrating indirectly that the formulas with Yahweh *ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ* are of earlier prophetic provenance.[99]

These findings are also confirmed by asseverations such as "for the mouth of Yahweh *ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ* has spoken" (Mic. 4:4) or Hezekiah's summons: "Hear the word of Yahweh *ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ*" (Isa. 39:5; cf. 2 K. 20:16 without *ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ*). This context also includes the introduction in Zech. 7:4, "the word of Yahweh *ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ* came to me" (also 8:1,18).

Finally the expression "Yahweh *ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ* is his name" is of interest in this context;[100] it occurs in Deutero-Isaiah (47:4; 48:2; 51:15; 54:5),[101] Amos (4:13; 5:27; [9:6]), and Jeremiah (10:16; 31:35; 32:18; 48:15; 50:34; 51:57). Am. 4:13 and 9:6 belong to the redactional creation hymn, and the expression in 5:27 is probably a redactional addendum.[102] The occurrences in Jeremiah also derive from later redactional activity. As such, this formula reflects the faith of the exilic-postexilic community.

The parallel statement in Isa. 54:5 reveals the content of Yahweh *ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ* in this context: "the God of the whole earth he is called." He is the creator God; as such, he alone is the powerful, majestic God. Other issues associated with this formula include God's just judgment and the debate with idolatry. The formula thus expresses the exilic-postexilic community's confession to the power and majesty of its God Yahweh,[103] whom it can, as explicitly stated in Jer. 48:15; 51:57, also predicate as "king." Hence one can quite correctly ascribe a "liturgical-hymnic character" to these concluding for-

---

97. Baudissin, 76-77.

98. Löhr, cited in Kautzsch, 622.

99. Baudissin, 74-77.

100. Crenshaw thoroughly examines this expression; cf. also F. Crüsemann, *Studien zur Formgeschichte von Hymnus und Danklied in Israel. WMANT* 32 (1969), 104ff.

101. See K. Elliger, *Deuterojesaja (40,1–45,7). BK* XI/1 (1978), 401.

102. H. W. Wolff, *Joel and Amos. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1977), 260.

103. See Elliger, *Deuterojesaja (40,1–45,7)*, 401; C. Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1969), 139-40.

mulas since they probably originated within the community's own worship practices[104] and in the redactional additions to Amos and Jeremiah express the postexilic community's praise of Yahweh's omnipotence.[105] The same applies to the expression "Yahweh the God *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ,* Yahweh is his memorial [NRSV 'name']" (Hos. 12:6[5]).

Isaiah's free use of the term *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ* is reflected in the fact that of its 56 occurrences in the book, only 9 are found in fixed formulas. Because Isaiah has obviously used the term quite consciously,[106] he is of particular importance both regarding the adoption of *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ* into prophetic literature in the larger sense and regarding how that usage shaped its content.

Isaiah himself adopted the title from Jerusalem temple theology,[107] as shown by the call narrative's association with the temple and with the (probably) liturgical trisagion in Isa. 6:3 as well as by the "liturgical formula" "Yahweh *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ,* who dwells on Mt. Zion" (8:18; cf. also 31:9).[108] The assertion in 18:7 that Mt. Zion is "the place of the name of Yahweh *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ*" shows that this verse is actually a late addendum.[109]

Isa. 6 emphasizes the holiness of Yahweh *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ* on the one hand, and his predication as "king" (v. 5) on the other. The remaining parallels to Yahweh *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ* in Isaiah confirm this inclination: "Holy God" (5:16), "Holy One of Israel" (5:24; cf. 10:20), "Mighty One of Israel" (1:24), or simply "God of Israel" (21:10; 37:16). Isaiah places special emphasis on the holiness of Yahweh *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ;* such holiness represents a cultic category reflected in Isaiah's assertion that Yahweh *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ* "shows himself holy" (5:16) and that the Israelites should "regard him as holy" in their "fear" and "dread" (8:13; cf. 10:24) and in general should "seek" him (9:12[13]). The royal aspect comes to expression in the emphatic designation "the Sovereign, Yahweh *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ*" (1:24; 3:1; 10:16; 19:4; cf. 3:15). Finally, the Song of the Vineyard points out that Yahweh *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ* is the owner of both the vineyard and the planting and is thus the Lord of both Israel and Judah (5:7).

Genitive constructions include "the hand" (Isa. 19:16), "the plan" (19:17), "the zeal" (9:6[7]; 37:32), and "the wrath" of Yahweh *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ* (9:18[19]; 13:13) as well as "a day of Yahweh *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ*" (2:12; 22:5), i.e., largely constructions articulating the seriousness of judgment.

The same applies to verbs with Yahweh *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ* as their subject. He reveals himself in Isaiah's ears (22:14; cf. 5:9), makes himself heard (21:10; 28:22), and swears (14:24). He takes away (3:1), sends "wasting sickness" (10:16), destroys (10:23), wields a whip (10:26), shatters (10:33), musters an army for battle (13:4), plans disaster (14:27; 19:12; 23:9), brings about plagues (29:6), calls to weeping and mourning (22:12), and descends upon Zion to fight (*liṣbōʾ,* 31:4).

By contrast, references to Yahweh *ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ* blessing (19:25) or protecting Jerusalem

---

104. A. Weiser, *Das Buch der Propheten Jeremia. ATD* 20/21 (1960), 399, 439.
105. J. Jeremias, *Hosea,* 154.
106. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12,* 29-30.
107. Stolz, *Samuel,* 214; cf. also Dumermuth, 71, 76.
108. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12,* 265, 370; cf. also Noth, 142.
109. Fohrer, *Jesaja,* 224 n. 39; O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 13–39. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1974), 90, 96-97.

(31:5) represent salvific promises that are as late as references to his wonderful counsel and excellent wisdom (28:29) and to how Yahweh *ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ* will be the garland of glory and diadem of beauty to the remnant of his people (28:5). Similarly, references in the Little Apocalypse to the rule of Yahweh *ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ* as king on Mt. Zion (24:23) and to the sumptuous feast he will prepare for all peoples there (25:6) draw the entire world into his eschatological kingship.

What does the title *ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ* mean for Isaiah? Some scholars take Isa. 6 as their point of departure in focusing on the "court" presupposed there over which Yahweh rules. On this view the *ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ* would represent something like heavenly beings or the pantheon of gods to which the title "king" would logically also apply; i.e., Yahweh is the king of the *ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ*. The passage, however, does not make such a statement at all. Rather, Yahweh is the lord and king of his people and as such chastises Israel and prepares for judgment. The *ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ* title seems to be associated more with Yahweh's "transcendent omnipotence and exaltedness" or with "the fullness of Yhwh's power."[110] Because the ark had been "retired" since the time of Solomon,[111] associating the term with the history of the ark tradition is not a viable possibility.

Isa. 31:4 does not militate against this view. An apparent wordplay or perhaps popular etymology with *ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ* asserts that "as a lion . . . growls over its prey, so will Yahweh *ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ* come down to fight *(liṣbōʼ)* upon Mt. Zion and upon its hill." Concerning the question of whether this passage represents an oracle of salvation or a threat, and the question of how the verb is thus to be construed, see the comms.

Scholars do not agree how many occurrences of *ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ* remain in Amos after one removes the redactional formulaic expressions. Am. 5:14-15 is not a Yahweh oracle; a different voice is interpreting the Yahweh oracle in 5:4, "Seek me and live." Even if the voice is that of Amos, the question then becomes whether the expression "Yahweh, the God *ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ*" (5:14-15) comes from the hand of Amos or from the redaction (as it does in 4:13[112]). The same might also apply to the threat in 5:16 and to the formula in 6:8; much suggests that Wolff's reference to Amos's "quite terse" style is on the mark, thus excluding Amos himself as a possible author.[113]

The only occurrence of *ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ* in Micah (4:4) is in a formula concluding the announcement of the time of peace: "for the mouth of Yahweh *ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ* has spoken." This formula is not found in the parallel text in Isa. 2:1-4, occurs without *ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ* in Isa. 1:20; 40:5; 58:14 (cf. Jer. 9:11[12]), and probably reflects the faith of the exilic-postexilic community.

In Nah. 2:14[13] and 3:5 we encounter the formula *nᵉʼum yhwh ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ*. It is part of the oracle of threat against Nineveh and understands Yahweh as "Lord of the cosmos."[114] Hab. 2:13a is the secondary gloss inserted by a later redactor.[115] In Zeph. 2:9

110. See, respectively, Eichrodt, I, 193; Fohrer, *History*, 165.
111. Kautzsch, 626.
112. Wolff, *Joel and Amos*, 231.
113. Ibid.
114. W. Rudolph, *Micha — Nahum — Habakuk — Zephanja. KAT* XIII/3 (1975), 178.
115. Ibid., 223.

the oracle against Moab is introduced by the formula "utterance of Yahweh *ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ*, the God of Israel," while v. 10 calls Israel the "people of Yahweh *ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ*."

Deutero-Isaiah uses the title *ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ* only in the expanded introductions and in the formulas already mentioned above. The parallel to "Yahweh, the King of Israel" is "his Redeemer, Yahweh *ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ*" (Isa. 44:6). The name of Israel's "Redeemer" and "Holy One" is Yahweh *ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ* (47:4; similarly 54:5), an allusion "to the nature of the one sending the message."[116] References to the King, Redeemer, and Holy One of Israel recall on the one hand the tradition of Isaiah from which Deutero-Isaiah adopted the title *ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ*, and on the other the notion of "God's majesty."[117]

Jeremiah's use of the term *ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ* does not provide anything fundamentally new. For the most part, the word appears in the introductions to his divine oracles, upon which it bestows a certain ceremonious tone. Jeremiah underscores the majesty and unchanging authority of Israel's God with dependent clauses such as "who planted you" (Jer. 11:17) or "who judges righteously, who tries the heart and the mind" (11:20), with supplementary epithets such as "the Holy One of Israel" (51:5) or "the King" (51:57), or with confessions to God as "the one who formed all things" (51:19).[118] Jeremiah knows he cannot avoid God's urgent call, but then rejoices at being God's possession and expresses that joy in his confession "for I am called by your name, O Yahweh, God *ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ*" (15:16).

The authors of Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi generally understand the term *ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ* in the same way. Jerusalem's temple has been established on the "mountain of Yahweh *ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ*" (Zech. 8:3) and is called "the house of Yahweh *ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ*" (Hag. 1:14; Zech. 7:3; 8:9; 14:21). Accordingly, Yahweh *ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ* is also the God of Jerusalem (Zech. 8:21-22; cf. Mal. 3:14); there he is worshiped as "King" (Zech. 14:16) or as "great King" (Mal. 1:14). Even though he has a special relationship with Judah (Zech. 9:13; 10:3; 12:5), he is nonetheless the Lord of the world (1:12,14-15), and Jerusalem a cosmopolitan holy city (14:21). Whoever this God sends will be acknowledged (2:13,15[9,11]; 4:9; 6:15). A new element associated with this late postexilic understanding is that Yahweh *ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ* is now viewed as the guarantor of compensatory judgment (1:6; cf. 7:12). Priests are now also viewed as his messengers (Mal. 2:7), a notion otherwise encountered only in Eccl. 5:5(6).[119]

5. *Qumran, Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha.* The term *ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ* occurs in only one passage in the Qumran writings. Significantly, it is found in the "blessing of the priests" with its statement, "May you be as an angel of the presence in the abode of holiness to the glory of the God *ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ*" (1QSb 4:25).[120]

---

116. Elliger, *Deuterojesaja (40,1–45,7),* 400.

117. Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66,* 139-40.

118. Weiser, *Jeremia,* 90, "his divine majesty over all heavenly and earthly powers."

119. See W. Rudolph, *Haggai — Sacharja 1–8 — Sacharja 9–14 — Maleachi. KAT* XIII/4 (1976), 266.

120. Concerning the numerous occurrences of *(kýrios) pantokrátōr* in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, see W. Bousset and H. Gressmann, *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter. Handbuch zum NT* 21 (Tübingen, [3]1926), 312 n. 2.

IV. Summary. Any summary must take as its point of departure the fact that the word *ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ* represents the most frequently used divine epithet in the OT and as such identifies an unmistakable characteristic of the OT understanding of God. Although the title began its ascendancy within the context of the temple cult, it would never have attained such high status without its adoption within the prophetic writings. The prophet Isaiah especially exerted such enduring influence with his use of the divine epithet *ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ* that the word continues to appear in the extremely late strata of the OT and even beyond, and this preeminent position bestowed on the designation *ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ* its unique content. Whether one understands this content as "Yahweh's collective military might,"[121] as his "might,"[122] or even as the "excelling majesty of this Lord of all,"[123] it is certain that it remained "the loftiest and grandest and . . . the royal name of God."[124]

Zobel†

---

121. Galling, "Ehrenname," 146.
122. Eissfeldt, *KlSchr,* III, 120.
123. O. Eissfeldt, → אדון *'āḏôn ('ādhôn),* I, 71.
124. H. Ewald, *Old and New Testament Theology* (Eng. trans. 1888), 93.

צְבִי *ṣᵉḇî* I and II

Contents: I. Etymology, LXX, Qumran: 1. Etymology of *ṣᵉḇî* I, "Ornament"; 2. Etymology of *ṣᵉḇî* II, "Gazelle"; 3. LXX; 4. Qumran. II. Gazelle: 1. As Food; 2. Symbol of Quickness and Flight; 3. Canticles. III. Ornament, Splendor: 1. Israel-Judah; 2. Foreign Nations.

I. Etymology, LXX, Qumran.

1. *Etymology of ṣᵉḇî I, "Ornament."* According to *HAL,*[1] *ṣᵉḇî* I, "ornament," derives from *ṣbh* II, "want, wish," and corresponds to Akk. *ṣibûtu(m).*[2] Both Gesenius and Zorell are more cautious with their derivations,[3] and indeed, *ṣibûtu,* "wish, intention,

---

ṣᵉḇî. E. Brunner-Traut, "Gazelle," *LexÄg,* II, 426-27; J. Feliks, "Gazelle," *BHHW,* I, 516-17; M. Gilula, "צְבִי in Isaiah 28,1 — A Head Ornament," *Tel Aviv* 1 (1974) 128; M. Görg, "Die Bildsprache in Jes 28,1," *BN* 3 (1977) 17-23; A. Salonen, *Jagd und Jagdtiere im alten Mesopotamien. AnAcScFen* B 196 (1976); E. Unger, "Gazelle," *RLA,* III, 153-54.

1. *HAL,* III, 997-98.
2. See Görg, 22.
3. *GesTh,* II, 1147-48; *LexHebAram,* 680.

need,"[4] does not have the same meaning as *ṣᵉḇî* in the OT unless one adduces the notion of "wishing" for precious things. Görg suggests a connection with Egyp. *ḏbꜣ*, "decorate, adorn," and believes Sem. *ṣby* underwent semantic expansion.[5] The meaning "to want, to long for," occurs in Imperial Aramaic, Nabatean, Palmyrene, and Jewish Aramaic.[6] The term *ṣby* allegedly also occurs on a fifth-century B.C.E. Elephantine ostracon with the meaning "ornaments" (for sale);[7] cf. Jewish Aram. *ṣiḇtāʾ*, Syr. *ṣēḇtā*, "splendor, finery," Palm. *tṣbythwn*, "her adornments."[8]

2. *Etymology of ṣᵉḇî II, "Gazelle."* The term *ṣᵉḇî* II, "gazelle," is related to Akk. *ṣabītu(m)*[9] and to Arab. *ẓaby*. Görg finds in Ugar. *ršp ṣbî* the phonetic connection between "soldier" *(ṣbʾ)* and "gazelle" *(ṣby)* in the application to Resheph, whose symbol is the gazelle as a companion and head adornment.[10] The metaphorical reference to the gazelle elsewhere emerges from the synonym *ṯr/šwr* ("my bulls," "my gazelles," in reference to dignitaries).[11] Both Egyp. Aram. *ṭby* and Imperial Aram. *ṣby* are also of interest in this context.[12] The term is used once to characterize Arpad as a hill of ruins, "a desolated mound for gazelles and foxes."[13] Personal names include male *ṣiḇyāʾ* (1 Ch. 8:9) and female *ṣiḇyâ* (2 K. 12:2[Eng. 1]; 2 Ch. 24:1), both of which derive from the southern wilderness region. Solomon's meals included gazelles (1 K. 5:3 [4:23]), and the descendants of his servants included *bᵉnê pōḵereṯ haṣṣᵉḇāyîm* (Ezr. 2:57; Neh. 7:59; "gazelle catcher"?[14]). The Jewish captives in Thebes included Sabiah, daughter of the Meshullam.[15] Additional personal names occur in Old South Arabic.[16]

3. *LXX*. The LXX uses several different words to translate *ṣby* I, including *dóxa* (Isa. 28:1), *éndoxos* (Isa. 13:19; 23:9), *eklektós* (Ezk. 7:20; 25:9). It then picks up the original meaning with *thélēma* (Dnl. 11:16), *thélēsis* (Dnl. 11:45); *boulḗ* (Isa. 4:2), perhaps *elpís* (Isa. 24:16; 28:4,5). The translations *anistánai* (Ezk. 26:20) and *stēloún* (2 S. 1:19) presuppose the base *n/yṣb*. In Jer. 3:19 *ṣby ṣbʾwt* is rendered as *theós pantokrátōr*. The rendering as *kēríon* (?) in Ezk. 20:6,15 remains obscure. Both Dnl. 11:16 and (Theodotion) 11:41,45 render only the root itself *ṣby*.

---

4. *AHw*, III, 1099; *CAD*, XVI, 167-71.
5. Görg, 21-23.
6. *DNSI*, II, 957; cf. J. A. Fitzmyer and D. J. Harrington, *Manual of Palestinian Aramaic Texts*. *BietOr* 34 (1978), 52.10; 40.7, 19.
7. *KAI* 270B.1.
8. Jastrow, 1258.
9. *AHw*, III, 1071; *CAD*, XVI, 42-44.
10. Görg, 19-20, with bibliog.
11. *KTU* 1.15, IV, 6-7, 17-18; cf. M. Dahood, *RSP*, III, 177-78, no. 344; J. M. Sasson, *RSP*, I, 419, no. 63; M. Dahood, "The Value of Ugaritic for Textual Criticism," *Bibl* 40 (1959) 161-62.
12. See *DNSI*, I, 419; II, 957.
13. *KAI* 222A.33; *ANET*, 660.
14. See *HAL*, III, 926b.
15. P. Grelot, *Documents araméens d'Égypte* (Paris, 1972), 397, no. 100, l. 4.
16. W. W. Müller, "Altsüdarabische Beiträge zum hebräischen Lexikon," *ZAW* 75 (1963) 313.

The LXX always renders *ṣby* II, "gazelle," as *dorkás/ádion/dórkōn*. The animal's beautiful bright eyes probably prompted a popular etymological connection with *dérkomai*, "gaze at, view."[17]

4. *Qumran*. In Qumran *ṣby* I occurs in 1QH 7:29 in the phrase *kwl ṣby rwḥ*, "all glory is wind." Passages with *rwḥ* in Ecclesiastes as well as Isa. 24:16; 23:9 are of possible interest in this context.[18] 11QT 52:11 offers a slightly different version of the text of Dt. 15:22, and 11QT 53:4 of Dt. 12:15. The PN *ṣby* occurs in a palimpsest with the meaning "splendor"[19] or "gazelle."[20] The name also appears on an ossuary.[21]

II. Gazelle.

1. *As Food*. The gazelle, of which there are allegedly fifteen different types,[22] is found in Israel especially as the *Gazella gazella* and the *Gazella dorcas*.[23] A catalog of four wild animals in 1 K. 5:3(4:23) mentions them as part of the food Solomon enjoyed along with the *'ayyāl*, "roebuck"(?) (cf. the similar listing for Ashurnasirpal II with five hundred roebucks and an equal number of gazelles[24]). The animal occurs in a series of seven (pure, i.e., edible) wild animals in Dt. 14:5.[25] The consumption of gazelles, as shown by the passages in Deuteronomy (12:15,22; 15:22) with reference *(kᵉ)* to the animals permitted for slaughter, seems to have been regulated only during a late period, placed under Yahweh's explicit blessing, and then the actual slaughtering reserved for the city area (*biš'āreyḵā*, 12:15,21), with special attention given to dealing with the blood (15:23). The division of participants into clean and unclean (12:15,22; 15:22) is probably also late.[26] One striking feature is that the gazelle is not mentioned as a sacrificial animal, since it was so used elsewhere, especially in the cult of Min, and was captured as part of the cult of the Ta'lab.[27]

2. *Symbol of Quickness and Flight*. The gazelle symbolizes the warrior's quickness in 2 S. 2:18 and 1 Ch. 12:9(8), like the hind as well *('ayyālâ)* in 2 S. 22:34 par. Ps.

---

17. Cf. H. Frisk, *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, I (Heidelberg, 1973), 410; O. Keller, *PW*, VII/1, 889.

18. S. Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot* (Aarhus, 1960), 138-39.

19. Mur 17B.2; so J. T. Milik, *DJD*, II, 96-97.

20. *HAL*, III, 998b.

21. L.-H. Vincent, "Nouvelles de Jérusalem," *RB* 9 (1900) 107; cf. Josephus *B.J.* 4.3.5 §145 *Dorkádos;* cf. O. Michel and O. Bauernfeind, eds., Josephus, *De Bello Judaico* II/1 (1963), 210 n. 31.

22. F. S. Bodenheimer, *Animal and Man in Bible Lands* (Leiden, 1960), 225.

23. J. Feliks, *EncJud*, VII, 345-46; O. Keel and M. Küchler, *Orte und Landschaften der Bibel* (Zurich/Cologne/Göttingen, 1984), I, 150-51.

24. W. Heimpel, *RLA*, IV, 419-20.

25. See P. C. Craigie, *The Book of Deuteronomy. NICOT* (1976), 230-31.

26. Regarding literary strata, cf. R. P. Merendino, *Das deuteronomische Gesetz. BBB* 31 (1969), in loc.; and G. Seitz, *Redaktionsgeschichtliche Studien zum Deuteronomium. BWANT* 93 (1971).

27. E. Brunner-Traut, 426; cf. *ANEP*, nos. 601, 618; Salonen, 256; M. Höfner, in Höfner, et al., *Die Religionen Altsyriens, Altarabiens und der Mandäer. RM* 10/2 (1970), 331ff.

18:34(33) (in somewhat weakened imagery in Hab. 3:19 in the language of war), and occasionally with the location *'al-hehārîm* (1 Ch. 12:8), *'al bāmôṯ* (2 S. 22:34), or *baśśāḏeh* (2 S. 2:18). Perhaps *š^e^luḥâ* in Gen. 49:21 is also an expression for quickness; Jgs. 5:18 similarly says of Naphtali, *'al m^e^rômê śāḏeh.*[28] Both Prov. 6:5 and Sir. 27:20 mention gazelles that have escaped probably from snares (a snare specific to gazelles was often used: *musaḫḫiptum, pāqātu*[29]). Here the reference is to escaping a pledge (Prov. 6:5) or escaping from a false friend (Sir. 27:20). In the ancient Near East, gazelles were generally captured in pits because probably only the king was permitted to hunt them with weapons.[30] Isa. 13:14 uses the hunted gazelle as a metaphor for the horrors of the day of Yahweh against Babylon.[31]

3. *Canticles.* Cant. 2:9 compares the beloved with the gazelle and the young stag leaping over the hills and doubtless reflects the exuberance associated with the quickness and energy of youth. The references to place *'al-hehārîm* and *'al-hagg^e^ḇā'ôṯ* (v. 8) recall 1 Ch. 12:8; 2 S. 22:34 par. Ps. 18:34(33); Hab. 3:19 (concerning the verb *dālag,* cf. Isa. 35:6). If the allusion to the king in the gazelle metaphor is not accidental (cf. 2 S. 1:19; 22:34),[32] then Cant. 2:17 and 8:14 are of particular interest. Cant. 2:17 associates the metaphor with the "blowing" of the day; as shown by the use of *ṣēl* with *yôm* (1 Ch. 29:15; Job 8:9; Ps. 102:12[11]; 144:4; Eccl. 6:12; 8:13), however, the metaphor also evokes the notion of death and night (Cant. 3:1). The verb *bāraḥ,* "make haste," in 8:14 also fits this context. Rather than referring to flight from friends (8:13) or, certainly, from the bride,[33] the imperative directed to the beloved in 8:6 implies a flight from the powers of death and separation that threaten love.

The ancient Near Eastern context supports this interpretation, since there the gazelle functions as an attribute to deities associated with the sun, the moon, and regeneration.[34] It comes as no surprise that Resheph was portrayed with erotic features and was depicted ithyphallically with Min and Qudshu (Qadesh).[35]

This interpretation also provides a better explanation for 2:7 and 3:5, which frame 2:9,17. Probably because the oath *(šb')* was almost always carried out with reference to the Deity,[36] the LXX translated as *en taís dynámesi/ischýsesi.* The field (*śāḏeh,* 7:12[11]) is explicitly mentioned as the place where the last tryst occurred (v. 13[12]), and the goddesses of love Ishtar and Artemis as well as Isis and Anukis are intimately associated

---

28. See esp. B. Jacob, *The First Book of the Bible: Genesis* (Eng. trans. 1974), 334.

29. Salonen, 49ff.; → יקשׁ *yāqaš,* VI, 288-89; *AuS,* VI, 323-24.

30. Salonen, 214, 135; *AuS,* VI, 322-23; *ANEP,* nos. 183, 190.

31. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27* (Eng. trans. 1997), 27; → נדח *nāḏaḥ,* IX, 240.

32. Unger, 153; the roebuck functions as a similar metaphor, Salonen, 210; also P. D. Miller Jr., "Animal Names as Designations in Ugaritic and Hebrew," *UF* 2 (1970) 184.

33. O. Keel, *Song of Songs* (Eng. trans. 1994), 285.

34. E.g., the Dumuzi cult: *WbMyth,* I, 88; Resheph: D. Conrad, "Der Gott Reschef," *ZAW* 83 (1971) 157-83; Min: R. Gundlach, *LexÄg,* IV, 136-40; Samā' Ta'lab: Höfner, *Religionen,* 247, 256, 266.

35. Görg, 20-23; *ANEP,* nos. 473, 474.

36. *GesB,* 803a.

with both gazelles and hinds[37] such that here one is adjuring or swearing not "by the deity itself but by its attributes."[38] Cant. 4:5 and 7:4[3] compare the beloved's breasts with "two fawns, twins of a gazelle," recalling similar imagery in Prov. 5:19. On the basis of OT passages and ancient Near Eastern iconography, Keel believes that "both breasts and fawns of a gazelle symbolize the warmth of life, an inspiring and victorious counterform to death," and that the lotus-eating gazelle in particular symbolizes regeneration (regarding the notion of fertility, see 4:2b; 6:6; 4:5; 7:4[3] evokes the image of the twins, recalling the fawns who provide the mother of Ningirsu with milk; cf. Cant. 8:1).[39]

III. Ornament, Splendor.

1. *Israel-Judah.* 2 S. 1:19 calls a specific group of persons (Saul and Jonathan) *haṣṣᵉḇî,* "ornament," a meaning confirmed by the synonym *gibbôrîm.* Perhaps the translation "Israel's gazelle" is more accurate given the specification *'al-bāmôṯeyḵā.*[40] If this text can be traced back as far as David,[41] then Isa. 28:1-4 represents a prophetic oracle by Isaiah dating to approximately 724 B.C.E.[42] The pride (ornament) and splendor *(ṣᵉḇî tip'artô)* of the drunkards of Ephraim, namely, the fertility of Samaria, will become a fading flower, and the proud garland *('ᵃṭereṯ gē'ûṯ)* is trampled underfoot (v. 3).[43] Gilula interprets *ṣby* here as "head ornament" with the head of a gazelle as its centerpiece, whereas Görg understands the fate of the "insignia" *ṣyṣ* and *ṣby* as a critique of the lofty ambience of the Judean court.[44]

In Jer. 3:19 the prophet clearly speaks for the first time about the land as the splendid ornament into which Yahweh will lead Judah and Israel home from exile; it is Yahweh's pleasant land (*ḥemdâ;* cf. 12:10, *ḥelqaṯ ḥemdāṯî*), the precious gem *(ṣᵉḇî ṣiḇ'ôṯ)* among the nations in contrast to Babylon and Tyre, whose glory and splendor has been destroyed (Isa. 13:19; 23:9).

Although Ezk. 20:6,15 continue Jer. 3:19, the language has now become formulaic and includes *nāśā' yāḏ,* "to raise one's hand,"[45] the formula used in reference to being led out of Egypt and being brought into the land,[46] and the description of the land as flowing with milk and honey (6 times in Deuteronomy[47]). The land is the glory *(ṣᵉḇî)*

37. E. Brunner-Traut; Keel, *Song,* 92-94.

38. Keel, *Song,* 94.

39. Quotation from ibid., 151. Cf. Salonen, 211; Heimpel, *RLA,* IV, 420.

40. Cf. Dahood, *Bibl* 40 (1959) 162; J. M. Sasson, *RSP,* I, 419; W. H. Shea, "Chiasmus and the Structure of David's Lament," *JBL* 105 (1986) 13-25, esp. 14-15.

41. D. L. Zapf, "How Are the Mighty Fallen! A Study of 2 Samuel 1:17-27," *Grace Theological Journal* 5 (1984) 95-126.

42. E. Vogt, "Das Prophetenwort Jes 28,1-4 und das Ende der Königstadt Samaria," *FS J. Prado* (Madrid, 1975), 109-30.

43. Cf. J. C. Exum, "'Whom Will He Teach Knowledge?': A Literary Approach to Isaiah 28," in D. J. A. Clines, et al., eds., *Art and Meaning. JSOTSup* 19 (1982), 108-39.

44. Görg, 23.

45. → נשׂא *nāśā',* X, 24ff.

46. → יצא *yāṣā',* VI, 225ff.; → בוא *bô',* II, 20ff.

47. Concerning the use of Dtr material in Ezk. 20, see J. Pons, "Polémique à Tel-Aviv en 591 av. J.C.," *ETR* 61 (1986) 165-75.

of all lands, just as in a reverse fashion the city of Jerusalem will become a disgrace *(ḥerpâ)* before the nations and a mockery *(qallāsâ)* to all the countries (22:4).

Like Jer. 3:19 and Ezk. 20:6, Isa. 4:2 has been cast as a promise ("on that day"). Yahweh's branch, which will become "pride and glory," is not the anointed king[48] but rather Zion, Jerusalem (each is mentioned 3 times), the "whole site of Mt. Zion." The text is doubtless postexilic.[49]

Israel turns their beautiful ornament *(ṣᵉḇî 'eḏyô)* into an object of overweening pride (*gā'ôn,* Ezk. 7:20). Here *ṣᵉḇî* probably refers to the land itself (v. 23, *hā'āreṣ*),[50] and *ṣᵉpûnî,* "my precious place," probably to the city and temple of Jerusalem (according to v. 23). The idols are those of foreign nations (16:17; 23:14), the detestable things that were Israel's companions since the days in Egypt (20:7,8) and into the land of Israel itself (11:18). Yahweh will make Israel's adornment "like the uncleanness of a woman" (36:17), a remark Zimmerli believes was added by Ezekiel's school.[51]

The emphatic *haṣṣᵉḇî* in Dnl. 8:9; 11:16,41 probably refers to the Jerusalem sanctuary.[52] The interpretation of *ṣᵉḇî* by *har-ṣᵉḇî-qōḏeš* in 11:45 especially supports this view. The notion of "land" becomes increasingly focused on the Jerusalem temple.

In Isa. 28:5-6,[53] instead of the crown of Ephraim's overweening pride (vv. 1,4), Yahweh himself will become the crown of glory *('ᵃṭereṯ ṣᵉḇî),* and instead of a fading flower (vv. 1,4) a crown of beauty. This imagery resembles that in 62:3 and 60:19, where Zion/Jerusalem is Yahweh's crown of beauty and Yahweh is Jerusalem's glory. As in 4:2, the salvific promise ("on that day") addresses the remnant of the people. Yahweh's dominion manifests itself in the assurance of internal justice and external military might.[54]

Isa. 24:14-16a was perhaps originally a hymn to Yahweh.[55] Yahweh, the Righteous One (or the pious Jews?[56]), is accorded splendor/glory (v. 16a). The righteous God is juxtaposed with fivefold human "treacherousness" *(bāḡaḏ),* and his glory with "terror, and the pit, and the snare" (cf. Jer. 48:43) throughout the world.

2. *Foreign Nations.* The oracle against the Moabites (Ezk. 25:8-11) calls Beth-jeshimoth, Baal-meon, and Kiriathaim the "glory of the country" (Moab; v. 9). This or-

---

48. See H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12* (Eng. trans. 1991), 165-66.

49. R. Kilian, *Jesaja 1–12. NEB* 17 (1986), 37-39.

50. → עדה *'āḏâ.*

51. → נדה *niddâ;* W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), 211-12.

52. Cf. K. Koch, "Vom profetischen zum apokalyptischen Visionsbericht," in D. Hellholm, ed., *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East* (Tübingen, 1983), 413-36, esp. 417-23; J. C. H. Lebram, "König Antiochus im Buch Daniel," *VT* 25 (1975) 737-72, esp. 768, with a different view in idem, *Das Buch Daniel. ZBK* 23 (1984), 94-95, 115-21; N. W. Porteous, *Daniel. OTL* (1965), 119, 124, 163; B. Hasslberger, *Hoffnung in der Bedrängnis. ATS* 4 (1977), 54, 235.

53. According to Exum, "Whom Will He Teach?" 133-35, the redaction of chs. 28–32.

54. H. Wildberger, *Jesaja (28–39). BK* X/3 (1982), 1050-51.

55. W. H. Irwin, "The Punctuation of Isaiah 24:14-16a and 25:4c-5," *CBQ* 46 (1984) 215-22.

56. So O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 13–39. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1974), 188.

acle is much more concise than Jer. 48 in both its expression of mockery (v. 8) and the enumeration of places (Josh. 13:17-20; Jer. 48:23: Baal-meon and Kiriathaim[57]). The oracle against Tyre in Isa. 23:9 already dates to the time of Esarhaddon (681-669 B.C.E.). Both the verb "crown" (*'ṭr,* v. 8) and the parallels to the verb "defile"[58] (cf. Ps. 89:40[39]; Ezk. 28:7) with the objs. *nēzer,* "garland," and *yip'â,* "radiant glory," evoke the idea of a crown. Instead of fertility in the land, the aspect of political rule is evoked (v. 11). M. Dahood, G. R. Driver, and others construe *ṣᵉḇî* personally as "nobles," a strict synonym to *niḵbaddê-'āreṣ;*[59] *śārîm,* "princes," in v. 8 is then to be read as *šārîm,* "bulls," analogous to the Ugaritic usage[60] (cf. 2 S. 1:19, *haṣṣᵉḇî gibbôrîm*). The end of that splendor is then total destruction (vv. 11b,13b,14).

Zimmerli suggests that Ezk. 26:20, with its description of Tyre's "descent into the Pit" (vv. 19-21), is the work of Ezekiel's school or of his circle of tradents.[61] Instead of the difficult MT *wᵉnāṯattî ṣᵉḇî (bᵉ'ereṣ ḥayyîm),* "I will place you as beauty in the land of the living," many scholars adduce the LXX *mēdé anastḗs,* "so that you do not rise up again" (Zimmerli). The Tg. reads "I bestow joy *(ḥydw')* in the land of Israel." If one supplies the negation from v. 20a, however, the text does not require emendation. The splendor of Tyre is probably its political power, its renown (v. 17), but also its sumptuous life (vv. 11-13). Instead of reigning as the splendor in the land of the living, it must descend into the world of the dead (*yāraḏ* 3 times in v. 20, *taḥaṯ*), into the pit *(bôr),* into dessication and flood, from which there is no return (v. 21b; *'ēneḵ, 'ôlām* 3 times in vv. 20-21). Instead of being extolled as the glory *(ṣᵉḇî)* of the living (v. 17, *hā'îr hahullālâ,* "city renowned"), Tyre is their dreadful specter *(ballāhôṯ).*

The oracle against Babylon in Isa. 13:19-22 exhibits several different literary relationships.[62] It is directed to the "glory of the kingdoms" (*ṣᵉḇî mamlāḵôṯ;* cf. Isa. 47:5, the "mistress of kingdoms," *gᵉḇereṯ mamlāḵôṯ*), the "splendor and pride of the Chaldeans." God, however, will reverse this good fortune so that "it will never be inhabited or lived in for all generations," and "its houses will be full of howling creatures." To this catalog, which already contains elements from the entire arsenal of OT maledictions,[63] the author adds the assurance of certain destruction (v. 22b).

Madl

---

57. *KAI* 181.9-10.
58. → חלל *ḥll,* IV, 409ff.
59. Dahood, *Bibl* 40 (1959) 161-62; G. R. Driver, "Isaiah 1–39: Textual and Linguistic Problems," *JSS* 13 (1968) 49.
60. See I.2 above.
61. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1983), 39-40.
62. J. D. W. Watts, *Isaiah 1–33. WBC* 24 (1985), 194-96.
63. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27,* 30.

צדק *ṣāḏaq*; צֶדֶק *ṣeḏeq*; צְדָקָה *ṣ^e^ḏāqâ*; צַדִּיק *ṣaddîq*

Contents: I. Comparable Terms in the Ancient Near East: 1. Egypt; 2. Mesopotamia; 3. Ugarit and West Semitic Languages. II. 1. Occurrences; 2. Meaning. III. 1. Related Terms; 2. Antonyms. IV. 1. Verb; 2. *ṣeḏeq;* 3. *ṣ^e^ḏāqâ;* 4. Distinction between *ṣeḏeq* and *ṣ^e^ḏāqâ;* 5. *ṣaddîq;* 6. *ṣdq min* V. Function: 1. Covenant; 2. Law; 3. Reconciliation; 4. Testing. VI. LXX. VII. Qumran.

ṣāḏaq. E. R. Achtemeier, "The Gospel of Righteousness: A Study of the Meaning of *Ṣdq* and Its Derivatives in the OT" (diss., Columbia, New York, 1959); O. Betz, "Rechtfertigung in Qumran," *Rechtfertigung. FS E. Käsemann* (Tübingen, 1976), 17-36; H. J. Boecker, *Redeformen des Rechtslebens im AT. WMANT* 14 (²1970); N. Bosco, "La nozione di 'giustizia' nell' AT," *Filosofia* 17 (1966) 475-94; H. Cazelles, "À propos de quelques textes difficiles relatifs à la justice de Dieu dans l'AT," *RB* 58 (1951) 169-88; idem, "De l'idéologie royale," *JANES* 5 (1973) 59-73; J. Coppens, "Le Ṣaddîq-'Juste,' dans le Psautier," *De la Tôrah au Messie. FS H. Cazelles* (Paris, 1981), 299-306; D. Cox, "Ṣedaqa and Mišpaṭ: The Concept of Righteousness in Later Wisdom," *SBFLA* 27 (1977) 33-50; H. Cremer, *Biblisch-theologisches Wörterbuch der neutestamentlichen Gräcität* (Gotha, ¹⁰1915); idem, *Die christliche Lehre von den Eigenschaften Gottes* (Gütersloh, 1897 = 1983); idem, *Die paulinische Rechtfertigungslehre im Zusammenhang ihrer geschichtlichen Voraussetzungen* (Gütersloh, ²1900); J. L. Crenshaw, "Popular Questioning of the Justice of God in Ancient Israel," *ZAW* 82 (1970) 380-95 = *Studies in Ancient Israelite Wisdom* (New York, 1976), 289-304; F. Crüsemann, "Jahwes Gerechtigkeit *(ṣ^e^dāqā/ṣādäq)* im AT," *EvT* 36 (1976) 427-50; P. Dacquino, "La formula 'giustizia di Dio' nei libri dell' AT," *RivB* 17 (1969) 103-19, 365-82; A. Descamps and L. Cerfaux, "Justice et justification," *DBS,* IV, 1417-1510; L. Diestel, "Die Idee der Gerechtigkeit, vorzüglich im AT, biblisch-theologisch dargestellt," *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie* 5 (1860) 173-253; A. Dünner, *Die Gerechtigkeit nach dem AT. Schriften zur Rechtslehre und Politik* 42 (1963); J. A. Dumke, "The Suffering of the Righteous in Jewish Apocryphal Literature" (diss., Duke, 1980); L. Epsztein, *Social Justice in the Ancient Near East and the People of the Bible* (Eng. trans. 1986); K. H. Fahlgren, *ṣ^e^dāḳā, nahestehende und entgegengesetzte Begriffe im AT* (Uppsala, 1932); C. Graesser Jr., "Righteousness, Human and Divine," *Currents in Theology and Mission* 10 (1983) 134-41; R. Gyllenberg, "Die paulinische Rechtfertigungslehre und das AT," *ST* 1 (Riga, 1935) 35-52; idem, *Rechtfertigung und AT bei Paulus. Franz Delitzsch Vorlesungen 1966* (Stuttgart, 1973); R. L. Honeycutt, "The Root ṢDḲ in Prophetic Literature" (diss., Edinburgh, 1970); B. Johnson, *Rättfärdigheten i Bibeln* (Göteborg, 1985); J. P. Justesen, "On the Meaning of *ṣāḏaq,*" *AUSS* 2 (1964) 53-61; O. Kaiser, "Gerechtigkeit und Heil bei den israelitischen Propheten und griechischen Denkern des 8.-6. Jahrhunderts," *Neue Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie und Religionsphilosophie* 11 (1969) 312-28; E. Kautzsch, *Ueber die Derivate des Stammes* ṣdq *im alttestamentlichen Sprachgebrauch* (Tübingen, 1881); E. Kellenberger, *Ḥäsäd wä^ä^mät als Ausdruck einer Glaubenserfahrung. ATANT* 69 (1982); K. Koch, "Gibt es ein Vergeltungsdogma im AT?" *ZTK* 52 (1955) 1-42; idem, "Die Entstehung der sozialen Kritik bei den Profeten," *Probleme biblischer Theologie. FS G. von Rad* (Munich, 1971), 236-57; idem, "Die drei Gerechtigkeiten: Die Umformung einer hebräischen Idee im aramäischen Denken nach dem Jesajatargum," *Rechtfertigung. FS E. Käsemann* (Tübingen, 1976), 245-67; idem, "צדק *ṣdq* to be communally faithful, beneficial," *TLOT,* II, 1046-62; R. Leivestad, "Guds straffende rettferdighet," *NTT* 47 Tilleggshefte (Oslo, 1946); M. C. Lind, "Monotheism, Power, and Justice: A Study in Isaiah 40–55," *CBQ* 46 (1984) 432-46; B. V. Malchow, "Social Justice in the Wisdom Literature," *BTB* 12 (1982) 120-24; J. L. Mays, "Justice:

I. Comparable Terms in the Ancient Near East. Terms comparable to Heb. *ṣeḏeq* include esp. Egyp. *mꜣʿ.t* and Akk. *mēšaru* and *kettu.* Additional material comes from Ugaritic evidence and inscriptional evidence in Phoenician and Aramaic.

1. *Egypt.* Although Egyp. *mꜣʿ.t* is often translated as "truth," its meaning is much more profound. "Maat is right order in nature and society, as established by the act of creation, and hence means, according to the context, what is right, what is correct, law, order, justice and truth."[1] The term *mꜣʿ.t* seems originally to have referred concretely to "straightness" and "evenness"[2] (cf. Heb. *yāšār*).

The king was responsible for maintaining Maat. The Pyramid Texts already assert that the dead king "established Maat in the place of disorder" *(ìsf.t).*[3] The assertion that

---

Perspectives from the Prophetic Tradition," *Int* 37 (1983) 5-17; D. Michel, "Begriffsuntersuchung über *ṣädäq-ṣᵉdaqa* und *ʾᵃmät-ʾᵃmuna*" (diss. Habil., Heidelberg, 1964); J. P. Miranda, *Marx and the Bible* (Eng. trans. 1974); B. Mogensen, "*ṣᵉdāqā* in the Scandinavian and German Research Traditions," in K. Jeppesen and B. Otzen, eds., *The Productions of Time: Tradition History in OT Scholarship* (Sheffield, 1984), 67-80; E. M. Nieto, "Justicia y Biblia," *FS J. Alonso Diaz. Miscelánea Comillas* 41 (1983), 269-80; F. Nötscher, *Die Gerechtigkeit Gottes bei den vorexilischen Propheten. ATA* VI/1 (1915); J. Pedersen, *ILC;* G. Pidoux, "Un aspect négligé de la justice dans l'AT: Son aspect cosmique," *RTP* 4 (1954) 283-88; G. von Rad, "'Righteousness' and 'Life' in the Cultic Language of the Psalms," *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays* (Eng. trans. 1966) 243-66; F. V. Reiterer, *Gerechtigkeit als Heil:* צדק *bei Deuterojesaja* (Graz, 1976); H. Graf Reventlow, *Rechtfertigung im Horizont des AT. BEvT* 58 (1971); idem, *Problems of OT Theology in the Twentieth Century* (Eng. trans. 1985); E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (Philadelphia, 1977); H. H. Schmid, *Gerechtigkeit als Weltordnung. BHT* 40 (1968); idem, "Rechtfertigung als Schöpfungsgeschehen," *Rechtfertigung. FS E. Käsemann* (Tübingen, 1976), 403-14; J. J. Scullion, "*Ṣedeq — ṣedaqah* in Isaiah cc. 40–66 with Special Reference to the Continuity in Meaning between Second and Third Isaiah," *UF* 3 (1971) 335-48; I. P. Seierstad, "Guds rettferd i Det gamle testamente," *TTK* 39 (1968) 81-104; N. H. Snaith, *The Distinctive Ideas of the OT* (repr. New York, 1975); O. da Spinetoli, "La 'giustizia' nella Bibbia," *BeO* 13 (1971) 241-54; J. H. Stek, "Salvation, Justice, and Liberation in the OT," *Calvin Theological Journal* 13 (1978) 133-65; F. J. Stendebach, "Gerechtigkeit als Treue," *BiKi* 34 (1979) 79-85; H. Thyen, *Studien zur Sündenvergebung im NT und seine alttestamentlichen und jüdischen Voraussetzungen. FRLANT* 96 (1970); E. Toaff, "Evoluzione del concetto ebraico di צְדָקָה," *Annuario di Studi Ebraici* 2 (1969) 110-22; K. van der Toorn, *Sin and Sanction in Israel and Mesopotamia. SSN* 22 (1985); J. Vella, *La giustizia ferense di Dio. RivB Sup* 1 (1964); R. Voeltzel, "Le juste," *RHPR* 62 (1982) 233-38; A. H. van der Weijden, *Die "Gerechtigkeit" in den Psalmen* (Nijmegen, 1952); M. Weinfeld, "'Justice and Righteousness' in Ancient Israel against the Background of 'Social Reforms' in the Ancient Near East," in H. J. Nissen and J. Renger, eds., *Mesopotamien und seine Nachbarn. XXV Rencontre RAI 1978. Berliner Beiträge zum Vorderen Orient* 1 (Berlin, 1982), 491-519; W. Zimmerli, "Alttestamentliche Prophetie und Apokalyptik auf dem Wege zur 'Rechtfertigung des Gottlosen,'" *Rechtfertigung. FS E. Käsemann* (Tübingen, 1976), 575-92.

On I: J. Bergman, *Ich bin Isis* (Uppsala, 1968); R. Grieshammer, "Maat und Ṣădäq: Zum Kulturzusammenhand zwischen Ägypten und Kanaan," *GM* 55 (1982) 35-42; S. Morenz, *Egyptian Religion* (Eng. trans. 1973); H. Ringgren, *Word and Wisdom* (Lund, 1947).

1. Morenz, 113.
2. Ibid.
3. *Pyr.* 1775b; → פשע *peša'.*

Amenemhet II "expelled disorder *(isf.t)* by appearing as Atum"[4] implies that what he actually does is repeat the act of creation. Tutankhamon similarly "has expelled disorder *(isf.t)* throughout the Two Lands, and Maat was set up so that it might make lying *(grg)* to be an abomination of the land, as in its first time,"[5] with "its first time" referring to the time of creation. The hymn to Merneptah presupposes the order of nature: "Truth drives out lying. . . . The water stands and is not dried up. . . . Days are long, nights have hours, and the moon comes normally."[6] Or "Maat came from the sky in their [the eight primal gods'] time and joined those living on earth; the country was in abundance, the bellies were filled."[7]

The procedure through which the king fulfills this obligation includes a daily sacrifice of a personified image of Maat during which he says, "I [the king] come to thee, I bring to thee Maat. Thou livest by her, thou rejoicest in her, thou art perfect in her, thou unitest by her, etc."[8] Maat is, as it were, the very essence of the gods that sustains the world, and this essence is strengthened by the Maat sacrifice. The stela of Haremheb identifies Maat with the vivifying north wind.[9] Egyptian art often portrays the king's throne upon a foundation constructed from the letters of the word "Maat."[10]

Personified as the goddess and daughter of Re, Maat stands on the bow of the sun barque whose course illustrates the cosmic order.[11] H. Frankfort has emphasized that wisdom teachers tried to put people in a position to internalize or assimilate this divine order.[12] Peculiarly, we read in Amenemope that God gives Maat "to whom he will," just as the king offers Maat ("bears" it, *fꜣy*).[13]

2. *Mesopotamia.* The Akk. *mī/ēšaru* (from the stem → ישר *yšr*) means "righteousness, justice," while *ki/ettu* (from the stem → כון *kwn*) means "truth, rightness, justice, loyalty."[14] The term *mēšaru* refers to the justice of a legal determination, the truth a person speaks, and the just order in the land, while *kettu* is the reliability of a premonitory sign, the loyalty of a servant, or the truth a person speaks (its pl. form, *kīnāti,* refers to Hammurabi's laws). Above all, however, these two words refer to the normal order within society and less to personal virtues.

Among human beings, *mēšaru* and *kettu* as well as Sum. *nì-si-sa* and *nì-zi-da* are the concern of the king and judge. One royal epithet calls the king *rā'im ketti u mēšari,* "he who loves justice and righteousness"; simpler versions include *rā'im ketti* or *rā'im*

4. *Urk.* VII, 27.
5. *Urk.* IV, 2026; cf. *ANET,* 251.
6. *ANET,* 378b.
7. See Ringgren, 46-47.
8. Ringgren, 48.
9. Bergman, 186.
10. H. Brunner, "Gerechtigkeit als Fundament des Thrones," *VT* 8 (1958) 426-28.
11. Ringgren, 45-52; Bergman, 198-99.
12. *Ancient Egyptian Religion* (New York, 1948), 65-72.
13. *NERT,* 59.
14. *AHw,* II, 659-60; I, 494-95, respectively.

mēšari.[15] Hammurabi was made king to cause justice *(mēšaru)* to prevail in the land *(šūpû),* to destroy the wicked *(raggu)* and the evil *(ṣēnu),*[16] so that, among other things, the strong might not oppress the weak. In the epilogue he proclaims that he established right and justice according to the custom of the land and promoted the welfare of the people.[17] Neriglissar asserts that he established justice *(mēšaru)* in the land and ruled his people in peace.[18] A letter to Esarhaddon says that in true *(kēnu)* visions Shamash and Adad bestowed upon the king "a good reign, well-ordered *(kēnu)* days and years of righteousness *(mēšaru),* plentiful rain, full rivers, and good prices."[19] The text does not say whether this good fortune in the land resulted from the king's wise rule or whether *mēšaru* as the cosmic order implies such good fortune from the outset. One might note that the epithet *muštēšir* can refer both to the proper guidance of human beings and to the guidance of streams and rivers and of the light of the cosmos.[20] In any event the social order remains the focal point. Other royal epithets include *šākin mēšari,* "he who creates righteousness," *šar mēšari,* "king of justice," and *dajjān kīnāti,* "judge of lawfulness" (cf. *šar kīnāti, šarru kēnu*).[21]

Among all the gods, it is especially Shamash who is the just judge *(dajjān kīnāti)* and "Lord of Justice and Righteousness" *(bēl mēšari u ketti).*[22] Finally, Mēšaru and Kettu, as personified or hypostatized characteristics of the sun god, also appear in the latter's retinue as gods.[23]

3. *Ugarit and West Semitic Languages.* The term *ṣdq* occurs only a few times in the Ugaritic texts. In the Legend of King Keret, *'tt ṣdqa,* "his legitimate wife," parallels *mtrḫt yšrh,* "his lawful spouse."[24] The title of the king of Ugarit is *b'l ṣdq,* either "Maintainer of Right" or "Legitimate Prince."[25] PNs include *ṣdq-il, ṣdq-šlm,* and *ṣdqn,* possibly also in reference to a divine pair as *ṣdq mšr.*[26]

A Phoenician inscription from Lapethos mentions a *ṣmḥ ṣdq,* a "legitimate offspring," and the expression *bn ṣdq* probably similarly refers to a "legitimate son" or heir.[27] Given the context with the par. *mlk yšr,* the *mlk ṣdq* is probably a "just king."[28] In the Karapete inscription Azitawadda boasts that of all the kings, he was "elected to fa-

15. Seux, 237.
16. CH, Prologue, I, 32-33.
17. CH, V, 29-30.
18. *VAB,* 4, 216, II, 2-3.
19. *ABL,* I, 29ff.
20. K. Tallqvist, *Akkadische Götterepitheta* (Helsinki, 1938), 150.
21. Seux, 271, 316-17, 66, 308, respectively.
22. Tallqvist, *Akkadische Götterepitheta,* 80, 47.
23. Ringgren, 53-59.
24. *KTU* 1.14, I 12.
25. *KTU* 7.63, 4; other passages are unclear, e.g., *KTU* 2.8, 5.
26. *PNU,* 187-88, 412; but cf. H. Gese, in Gese, et al., *Die Religionen Altsyriens, Altarabiens und der Mandäer. RM* 10/2 (1970), 170 n. 528.
27. *KAI* 43.11; *KAI* 16.1.
28. *KAI* 4.6; see also 10.9.

therhood" because of his justice *(ṣdq)*, wisdom *(ḥkmty)*, and the goodness of his heart *(n'm lby)*.[29] In Aramaic inscriptions *ṣdq* generally exhibits the semantic nuance "loyalty."[30] In an inscription from Tema *ṣdqh* refers to a fealty gift.[31] All these examples deal with the notion of loyalty within a vassal relationship.

Philo of Byblos mentions among the Phoenician gods the pair Misor and Sydyk, "that is, *eúlytos* and *díkaios*," the latter of whom was allegedly the father of Asclepius (Eshmun).[32] These terms are presumably supposed to translate *mîšôr* and *ṣeḏeq*, attesting then a West Semitic correspondence for Mešaru and Kettu. Although the god *mîšôr* is not attested by inscriptional evidence, several PNs attest *ṣeḏeq*, including Heb. *malkî-ṣeḏeq* (Gen. 14:18) and *'ᵃḏōnî-ṣeḏeq* (Josh. 10:1,3), Rab-ṣidqi,[33] the previously mentioned names from Ugarit, and Phoen. *ṣdq-mlk*.

In Arabic, *ṣadaqa* means "be true," and in form II "believe, hold to be true"; *ṣidq*, however, is not only "truth" as such, but also an expression of the bedouin male ideal in ancient poetry, "courage, dependability, competence."[34] Related terms include OSA *ṣdq*, "fulfill an obligation, keep in order," as a substantive "justice, righteousness, truth,"[35] and Eth. *ṣādĕq*, "good, just," *ṣĕdq*, "justice, righteousness." In Syriac, *ṣ* is replaced by *z*, yielding *zedqā'*, "what is right, responsible; instruction, prescription; duty."[36] The root is not found in Akkadian.

Ringgren

II. 1. *Occurrences*. The root *ṣdq* occurs 523 times in the OT, to which one can add the PNs and Aram. *ṣiḏqâ* (Dnl. 4:24[Eng. 27]). Most of the occurrences are found in the prophets (esp. Deutero-Isaiah), the Psalms, and wisdom literature, while occurrences in the historical books are sparser.

2. *Meaning*. Scholarly debate has generally focused on two different understandings of the OT notion of righteousness and justice. One view construes the notion of *ṣdq* "legally" and understands righteousness as concurrence with a standard or norm. Whoever watches over righteousness and justice (ultimately God) also distributes reward and punishment according to whether the righteousness in question corresponds to that norm. Antitheses include terms such as "mercy," "compassion," and "salvation."

Other scholars understand the notion of *ṣdq* as virtually synonymous with deliverance and salvation, describing it as a relation with God rather than as related to a norm established by God. God's beneficent and saving intervention is then an expression of his righteousness rather than its opposite, and the notion of chastising divine righteous-

---

29. *KAI* 26A.I.12-13.
30. *KAI* 215 (ll. 1,11,19), also 216.4-5; 217.5; 219.4, all from Zenjirli; cf. *ṣdqh* in 226.2.
31. *KAI* 228A.15.
32. *Praep. ev.* 1.10.10, 18.
33. EA 170:37.
34. See H. Ringgren, "The Root ṢDQ in Poetry and the Koran," *Ex Orbe Religionum. FS G. Widengren. Numen Sup* 22 (Leiden, 1972), 134-35.
35. Beeston, 141.
36. *LexSyr*, 189.

ness is viewed at most as a secondary effect directed against those who would obstruct such divine intervention.

Diestel's work (1860) was the first modern study of the OT understanding of *ṣdq*. Diestel understood God's righteousness as his salvific intervention and rejected the notion of chastising divine righteousness as such. Cremer developed Diestel's view further, suggesting that *ṣdq* was definitely a relational term involving a real relationship between two entities, between an object and a subject, but not a relationship in which an object is related to an idea (or to its idea) and is subject to evaluation.[37] Cremer believed that the crucial factor was the relationship to the claims made by a person, claims emerging from the existing relationship. The relationship itself is the norm. The just person is one who exercises right, is right, and is proven right. The concept remains a forensic one in that God's own righteousness is the refuge of the supplicant; it becomes soteriological as well in that the person for whom God intervenes is also in the right. Here Cremer finds the point of departure for Paul's proclamation.

Kautzsch and Nötscher developed this juridical-legalistic understanding of *ṣdq* further, and this particular view was for many years the regnant one. Indeed, it even significantly influenced the understanding of the OT notion of righteousness and justice in other theological disciplines as well.

Pedersen developed a different view, strongly emphasizing that such OT ideas should be assessed in their own, i.e., peculiarly OT, contexts. He understood *ṣdq* as "health of the soul." The normal, healthy soul acts according to its nature. In the OT such action involves keeping the covenant by helping the weak and honoring the strong. Although Pedersen was criticized for having inaccurately described the people of the OT, his suggestions did help dissuade scholars from forcing their understanding of *ṣdq* into modern categories.

Fahlgren described the concept of *ṣdq* more closely by comparing it with related and antonymical terms. The Israelites' underlying understanding of life is allegedly "synthetic"; act and consequence are thus indissolubly connected. Fahlgren followed Kautzsch and Pedersen in specifying the content of *ṣdq* as a person's performance and habitus. With reference to divine righteousness, he suggested a basic meaning of "fellowship loyalty" to which such concepts as deliverance, victory, and salvation can then be related.[38]

In the following period different answers were given to the question whether *ṣdq* also includes the notion of chastising divine righteousness or justice. Although P. Heinisch and J. Ruwet[39] tried to preserve both aspects within the concept of *ṣdq*, the OT generally describes God's chastising righteousness with other terms.[40] Leivestad

---

37. Cremer, *Biblisch-theologisches Wörterbuch,* 300.

38. Fahlgren, 50-51, 96-97, 105.

39. P. Heinisch, *Theology of the OT* (Eng. trans. 1950), 90-96; J. Ruwet, "Misericordia et iustitia Dei in V.T.," *VD* 25 (1947) 35-42, 89-98.

40. → אשׁם *'āšām ('āshām),* I, 429ff.; → יסר *yāsar,* VI, 127ff.; → כלה *kālâ,* VII, 157ff.; → נגף *nāgap,* IX, 210ff.; → נקם *nāqam,* X, 1ff.; → נשׂא *nāśā' ('āwôn),* X, 24ff.; → פקד *pāqaḏ;* → שׁלם *šālēm;* → שׁפט *šāpaṭ,* etc. Cf. K. Koch, ed., *Um das Prinzip der Vergeltung in Religion und Recht des ATs. WdF* 125 (1972).

studied the root *ṣdq* specifically in connection with God's chastising righteousness and found that in only 3 OT passages (Isa. 5:16; 10:22; Zeph. 3:5) does *ṣdq* possibly refer to such chastising righteousness.

Subsequent scholars returned to the understanding promoted by Diestel and Cremer.[41] It was especially von Rad and Koch, however, who underscored the character of OT righteousness as a positive, salvific activity. Von Rad emphasized that *ṣdq* is always to be understood as a gift rather than as punishment, remarking contra Nötscher that "no references to the concept of a punitive צְדָקָה can be adduced — that would be a *contradictio in adiecto*."[42] Koch continued Fahlgren's idea and assumed the presence of a sphere of activity affecting a person's fate. "By one's deed, one 'creates' a sphere that produces well-being and misfortune and that continues to surround one. This sphere is substantial and belongs to oneself in a manner resembling one's property." Following von Rad, however, Koch emphasized more strongly that "the capacity to do good and thus the prerequisite for a relationship between good deed and well-being must first be granted to individuals or the people Israel."[43] These suggestions have generally been well received.[44]

Several new tendencies are discernible in more recent scholarship. H. H. Schmid relates righteousness directly to the concept of order.[45] Reventlow picks up on this notion and defines the concept of order broadly enough to identify righteousness as one of the central themes in the OT.[46]

Linguistic studies have also focused on the concept of *ṣdq*, especially in Deutero-Isaiah (Reiterer). Within the framework of liberation theology, Miranda has objected to any link between *ṣdq* and covenant and instead subsumes *ṣdq* under the concept of → מִשְׁפָּט *mišpāṭ*. Several studies suggest a synthesis between understanding righteousness on the one hand primarily as a gift, and on the other as a concept also encompassing the idea of normative assessment and at times even of chastisement.[47] Finally, the traditional Jewish understanding of righteousness em-

---

41. Forerunners include H. W. Hertzberg, "Die Entstehung des Begriffes משפט im AT," *ZAW* 41 (1923) 16-76; F. Horst, "Die Anfänge des Propheten Jeremia," *ZAW* 41 (1923) 94-153; then Gyllenberg; Snaith, e.g., 72ff.; S. Lyonnet, "De 'iustitia Dei' in Epistola ad Romanos," *VD* 25 (1947) 23-34; Cazelles, *RB* 58 (1951) 169-88; van der Weijden; and E. Beaucamp, "La théophanie du Psaume 50(49)," *NRT* 81 (1959) 897-915; idem, "La justice de Yahvé et l'économie de l'alliance," *SBFLA* 11 (1960) 5-55.

42. G. von Rad, *Theology of the OT*, 2 vols. (Eng. trans. 1962-65), I, 377.

43. *TLOT*, II, 1053.

44. Cf. E. Achtemeier, "Righteousness in the OT," *IDB*, IV, 80-85; W. Mann, "Gerechtigkeit," *Handbuch theologischer Grundbegriffe* (Munich, 1962), I, 468-79.

45. See O. Procksch, *Theologie des ATs* (Gütersloh, 1950), 568ff.; also Pidoux.

46. *Rechtfertigung im Horizont des AT*; idem, *Problems*, 179ff.

47. E.g., Seierstad; Dacquino, who emphasizes esp. the eschatological character of "God's righteousness"; Honeycutt; C. F. Whitley, "Deutero-Isaiah's Interpretation of Sedeq," *VT* 22 (1972) 469-75; J. L. McKenzie, *Theology of the OT* (Garden City, N.Y., 1974); J. Piper, "The Righteousness of God in Romans 3:1-8," *TZ* 36 (1980) 3-16. For more general surveys of the status of scholarship, see esp. Crüsemann; Koch, *TLOT*; Reventlow, *Problems*.

phasizes the ethical aspect and poses the question of the suffering of the righteous.[48]

III. 1. *Related Terms.* Derivatives of *ṣdq* often appear together with related terms. Fahlgren's foundational study deals with the synonymous or related terms *mišpāṭ, ḥeseḏ, ʾᵉmeṯ, raḥᵃmîm, kāḇôḏ, šālôm,* and *ṭôḇ,* though additional terms could easily be added.

a. Parallels such as → אמן *ʾāman,* → חסד *ḥeseḏ,* and → שלום *šālôm* designate the condition of a general, positive communal relationship or fellowship. The term *ṣdq* together with the pars. *ʾᵉmeṯ/ʾᵉmûnâ* refer to the ordered relationships with nature (Ps. 85:11-12[10-11]), in God's dealings with human beings (Neh. 9:33; Ps. 40:11[10]; 96:13; 143:1; Hos. 2:21,22[19,20]; cf. also Isa. 48:1; Jer. 4:2; Zech. 8:8), between David and God (1 K. 3:6), between the king and the people (Isa. 11:5), and among people generally (1 S. 26:23; Prov. 12:17; Isa. 1:26; 26:2; 59:4). In an ordered, well-established situation, often in a relationship between a superior and a subject, *ʾmn* and *ṣdq* refer to actions commensurate with the positive expectations of one's surroundings. The actions of just persons show that they are dependable.

The *ṣeḏeq* of either God or the king is associated with *ḥeseḏ* (Ps. 85:11[10]; 89:15[14]; Hos. 2:21[19]). God's *ḥeseḏ* and *ṣᵉḏāqâ* are beneficent (Ps. 33:5; 36:11[10]; 40:11[10]; 103:17; Jer. 9:23[24]; Hos. 10:12) and should be pursued (Prov. 21:21). The terms *ṣaddîq* and *ḥāsîḏ* are used parallel with reference to God (Ps. 145:17) and people (Ps. 37:25ff.; Isa. 57:1), while *ṣeḏeq* and *šālôm* together describe fortunate, well-ordered circumstances (Ps. 35:27; 85:11[10]), as do *ṣᵉḏāqâ* and *šālôm,* though the last two seem to emphasize more the action itself (Ps. 72:3; cf. v. 7, where *šālôm* follows *ṣaddîq;* Isa. 48:18; 60:17). Indeed, *šālôm* itself can even result from *ṣᵉḏāqâ* (Isa. 32:17). The adj. *šālēm* is used together with *ṣeḏeq* to refer to full and "just" weights and measures (Dt. 25:15).

Use of *ṣdq* with *ʾmn* emphasizes especially a situation that is well established and dependable, while its use with *ḥeseḏ* emphasizes generosity, and with *šālôm* the element of harmony. Kellenberger articulates the delimitation of *ṣdq* from *ḥeseḏ* and *ʾᵉmeṯ/ʾᵉmûnâ,* while G. Gerleman focuses on the delimitation from *ḥeseḏ.*[49]

b. One important parallel to *ṣdq* is God's → ישׁע *yšʿ,*[50] his beneficent, saving intervention as an expression of his righteousness (Isa. 45:8; 51:5ff.; 61:10; 63:1; cf. also Ps. 65:6[5]; 71:2; 98:2; 116:5-6; 118:15; 119:123; Isa. 45:21; 56:1). The king can also function as subject with such a parallel (Zech. 9:9), as can Jerusalem, which is said to possess or receive *ṣeḏeq* and *yᵉšûʿâ* (Isa. 62:1).

In Ps. 24:4-5 *ṣᵉḏāqâ* parallels *bᵉrāḵâ;* "those who have clean hands and pure hearts" will receive God's blessing and righteousness. Other parallels expressing strength and

---

48. F. Rosenthal, "Ṣedâḳâ, Charity," *HUCA* 23/1 (1950/51) 411-30; L. Jacobs, *EncJud,* XIV, 180-84.

49. Kellenberger, 43, 64ff., 87ff.; G. Gerleman, "Das übervolle Mass: Ein Versuch mit Haesaed," *VT* 28 (1978) 151-64.

50. See esp. → VI, 458ff.

readiness include *zᵉrôaʿ* (Isa. 59:16); noteworthy associations in this regard also include *gᵉḇûrâ* (Ps. 71:16ff.) and *yᵉšûʿâ* (Ps. 98:1-2), also *gibbôr* (Isa. 49:24), *ʿōz* (Isa. 45:24), *kōaḥ* (Job 37:23), and the series of parallels in Ps. 111. In Ps. 22:32(31) *ʿāśâ,* "do, carry out," is used as an absolute parallel, while its antitheses include useless human acts (Isa. 57:12). Judging acts of deliverance also appear in the same context as *ṣdq* (Ps. 71:2; 72:2; 82:3-4; Prov. 31:9; Jer. 20:12; cf. also Ps. 7:12[11]).

c. The element of legitimacy attaching to *ṣdq* can also evoke the claim for a fitting show of respect or honor. In such cases *ṣdq* appears together with *kāḇôḏ* (Ps. 97:6; 112:9; Prov. 8:18; 21:21; Isa. 58:8; 62:2), with *šēm* and *tᵉhillâ* (Ps. 48:11[10]; 89:17[16]; 143:11; Isa. 61:11; cf. also Ps. 98:1-2; Isa. 45:25), with *nôrāʾōṯ* (Ps. 45:5[4]; 65:6[5]), *hôḏ-wᵉhāḏār* (111:3; cf. 45:5[4]), *śāś* (Isa. 64:4[5]), and *tip̄ʾereṯ* (together with *tᵉšûʿâ,* Isa. 46:13). Jer. 31:22(23) uses *nᵉwēh-ṣeḏeq* parallel with *har haqqōḏeš.* Other parallels to *ṣdq* include *ʾôr* (Ps. 97:11; 112:4; Prov. 4:18) and often *mišpāṭ* (Ps. 37:6; Isa. 59:9; Mic. 7:9; Zeph. 3:5).

d. The most frequent parallel to *ṣdq* is → משפט *mišpāṭ* (about 80 times). The established order is often described by *ṣeḏeq,* and when that order is itself emphasized, authors tend to distinguish less between *ṣdq* and *mišpāṭ.*[51]

Ps. 19:10(9) uses the verb *ṣāḏaq* to characterize Yahweh's *mišpāṭîm* as righteous. Job asserts, "I am in the right *(ṣāḏaqtî),* and yet God has taken away my *mišpāṭ*" (Job 34:5); Yahweh responds, "Will you even break my *mišpāṭ?* Will you condemn me that you may be justified *(tiṣdaq)*?" (Job 40:8).

The two terms *ṣeḏeq* and *mišpāṭ* are often used parallel and seem to be synonymous. They are present in Jerusalem (Isa. 1:21); the ruler seeks *mišpāṭ* and is swift to foster *ṣeḏeq* (Isa. 16:5). Such parallel usage, however, can also indicate an intensification. When God's *mišpāṭîm* come, the inhabitants of the world learn *ṣeḏeq* (Isa. 26:9). The king is to judge his own people with *ṣeḏeq* and his poor with *mišpāṭ* (Ps. 72:2; cf. also Job 29:14; Ps. 37:6; Isa. 32:1; Jer. 22:13). In the expression *mišpᵉṭê ṣiḏqeḵā* (Ps. 119:7,62,106,164; cf. also vv. 75,160), *ṣeḏeq* is apparently the overriding concept characterizing *mišpāṭ.* Ps. 94:15 evokes the same context in its assertion that "*mišpāṭ* will return to *ṣeḏeq*"; *ṣeḏeq* is the overriding principle to which *mišpāṭ* ideally corresponds (hence the reading *ṣaddîq* in the Syr. and elsewhere is to be rejected as secondary). Cf. also Job 8:3; 35:2; Eccl. 3:16.

An even more frequent juxtaposition associates *mišpāṭ* and *ṣᵉḏāqâ.* God, the king, or the individual administers or exercises *(ʿāśâ)* "justice and righteousness" (2 S. 8:15; 1 K. 10:9; Jer. 9:23[24]; Ezk. 18:5, etc.). The sequence can also be *ṣᵉḏāqâ* and *mišpāṭ(îm)* (Gen. 18:19; Dt. 33:21; Isa. 58:2). A king's reign can be established and upheld with *mišpāṭ* and *ṣᵉḏāqâ* (Isa. 9:6[7]). Yahweh expects *mišpāṭ* and *ṣᵉḏāqâ;* indeed, by justice and righteousness he is exalted and shows himself holy (5:7,16). He fills Zion with it (33:5). He loves *ṣᵉḏāqâ* and *mišpāṭ* (Ps. 33:5); through it Zion and those

51. A. Shusterman, *The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia* (New York, 1939ff.), IX, 165; Miranda, 93ff.; Cox, Cazelles (*JANES* 5 [1973] 68ff.) and H. Niehr (*Herrschen und Richten: Die Wurzel* špṭ *im Alten Orient und im AT. FzB* 54 [1986], 358ff.) have presented exhaustive studies of this conceptual pair.

who repent are redeemed (Isa. 1:27). The people should maintain and exercise *mišpāṭ* and *ṣᵉḏāqâ* (56:1), though sometimes justice and righteousness can be far from the people and even be turned back (59:9,14).

Amos uses similar imagery. The people turn *mišpāṭ* into wormwood and trample *ṣᵉḏāqâ* underfoot (Am. 5:7; cf. 6:12). Amos hopes that *mišpāṭ* will "roll down like waters," and *ṣᵉḏāqâ* "like an ever-flowing stream" (5:24). These two terms are occasionally identified with corresponding or contrasting terms, e.g., with a "line" and "plummet" (Isa. 28:17), with "mighty mountains" and the "great deep" (Ps. 36:7[6]). Similarly, *mišpāṭ* will dwell in the wilderness, and *ṣᵉḏāqâ* in the fruitful field (Isa. 32:16). When used with *ṣaddîq, mišpāṭ* often refers to the results or practical consequences of righteousness. The ways of the Lord are *mišpāṭ* because he is also *ṣaddîq* (Dt. 32:4; cf. Job 34:17; Ps. 119:137; Zeph. 3:5). A person who is *ṣaddîq* also fosters *mišpāṭ* (Ps. 1:5; 37:30; Prov. 12:5; 21:15); when the wicked beguile the *ṣaddîq, mišpāṭ* is perverted (Hab. 1:4).

The two terms *mišpāṭ* and *ṣdq*, however, are not synonymous. The semantic field of "decision, judgment, law" attaches to *mišpāṭ*, while *ṣdq* focuses on the principle of "what is right, correct." When *mišpāṭ* then expands its semantic functions toward concrete commandments or actions, *ṣᵉḏāqâ* can follow in that direction a bit further than can *ṣeḏeq*.

Close parallels include *naḥᵃlâ*, "lot, fate,"[52] in Isa. 54:17, and *ḥēleq*[53] and *zikkārôn*[54] in Neh. 2:20. Here the meaning is "portion, legal right."

The term *tôrâ* also appears together with *ṣdq*, though in reference not to the fulfillment of individual commandments, but to the harmony between "knowing *ṣeḏeq*" and "having God's *tôrâ* in one's heart" (Isa. 51:7). Ps. 119 juxtaposes *ṣdq* with several different terms referring to the law (vv. 40,138,142,144,172). Similar references are made to the "straight way" (Ps. 5:9[8]; Prov. 2:9), though in this parallel *ṣdq* strikingly seems to inhere more in God as the lawgiver rather than in people as those who fulfill the law.[55]

e. Words for grace, mercy, compassion *(raḥᵃmîm, raḥûm, ḥannûn)* appear in various contexts with *ṣdq* (Ps. 111:3-4; 112:4; 116:5; Hos. 2:21[19]). Although they do indeed articulate a particular aspect of *ṣdq*, they are not really synonymous. Fahlgren has suggested that *mišpāṭ, ṣᵉḏāqâ, ᵓᵉmeṯ, ḥeseḏ*, and *raḥᵃmîm* all designate various degrees along a scale at either end of which *mišpāṭ* refers more to duty or obligation and *raḥᵃmîm* more to feeling.[56]

f. Several parallels allude to a positive characteristic or demeanor. Such include → ישר *yāšār*, which with *ṣᵉḏāqâ* or *ṣaddîq* is used with references to the "way" (Ps. 5:9[8]; Prov. 29:27) and to the "heart" (Dt. 9:5; 1 K. 3:6; Ps. 32:11; 36:11[10]; 64:11[10]; 94:15; 97:11). Other parallels include *ṣaddîq(îm)* and *yᵉšārîm* (Job 17:8-9; Ps. 33:1; 140:14[13]; Prov. 21:18). The Lord is both *ṣaddîq* and *yāšār* (Dt. 32:4; cf. Ps.

---

52. → נחל *nāḥal*, IX, 319ff.
53. → IV, 448-49.
54. → IV, 78-79.
55. See V.2 below.
56. Fahlgren, 146.

119:137), and as *ṣaddîq* has an enduring relationship with the *yᵉšārîm* (Ps. 112:4). Similarly, *ṣeḏeq* and various forms of *yšr* are used in parallel (Prov. 1:3; 2:9), often in connection with correct speech or just judgments (Ps. 9:9[8]; 58:2[1]; 98:9; Prov. 8:6ff.; 16:13; Isa. 11:4; 45:19; cf. *ṣᵉḏāqâ* as the consequence of *mêšārîm* in Ps. 99:4; cf. also Prov. 11:6).

When describing a person's disposition, attitude, and overall demeanor, *ṣdq* is used parallel with *tām* and related words (Job 9:20; 12:4; 22:3; Ps. 7:9[8]; 15:2; cf. also Prov. 11:5; 13:6; 20:7; Job 31:6). Noah is an *'îš ṣaddîq* and *tāmîm* (Gen. 6:9). Yahweh's works are *tāmîm,* his ways are *mišpāṭ,* and he himself is *ṣaddîq* and *yāšār* (Dt. 32:4). Other parallels in this context include *ṭôḇ* together with *ṣaddîq* (1 K. 2:32; Prov. 2:20; 13:22; Eccl. 7:20; 9:2; Isa. 3:10), and the subst. *ṭûḇ* with *ṣᵉḏāqâ* (Ps. 145:7). Here *ṭôḇ* exhibits a broader semantic spectrum and as a result does not seem to focus on any specific aspect of *ṣdq*.

When ethical-moral issues are addressed, →טהר *ṭāhôr* is used parallel with *ṣdq* (Job 4:17; 17:9; Eccl. 9:2), though also *bōr* (Ps. 18:21,25[20,24]). Legal aspects are emphasized when the parallel is *nāqî* (Ex. 23:7; Job 17:8-9; 22:19; 27:17; Ps. 94:21; Prov. 11:21).[57] The *ṣaddîq* is identified with the innocent as in the case of → זכה *zāḵâ* (Job 15:14; 25:4; Ps. 51:6[4]). Other parallels with similar meaning are *nāḵôn* (Ps. 112:6-7) and *yir'aṯ 'ᵉlōhîm/yhwh* (2 S. 23:3; Ps. 19:10[9]; 111:10).[58]

g. The terms *ṣaddîq* and *ḥāḵām* are often used together in wisdom literature (Prov. 9:9; 11:30; 23:24).[59] God holds both in his hands (Eccl. 9:1). The *ṣaddîq* utters *ḥoḵmâ* (Ps. 37:30). The kind of exaggerated righteousness and wisdom one is advised to avoid (Eccl. 7:16) is probably to be understood as an overt "self-actualization of wisdom."[60] Other parallels include *maśkîl* (Job 22:2-3; cf. also Dnl. 12:3) and *nᵉḏîḇîm* (Prov. 17:26). Together with the wise, the righteous are part of the elite, the elect group (which later in Qumran also acquired special status).

h. In a fashion almost antithetical to the previous usage, *ṣaddîq* is also identified with the oppressed. Ps. 82:3-4 entreats God to "justify" the weak and the orphan, the lowly and the destitute, and Ps. 146:7-9 identifies the *ṣaddiqîm* with the oppressed, the hungry, with prisoners, the blind, those who are bowed down, strangers, orphans, and widows. All are part of the fellowship of the righteous and can thus legitimately claim their portion in righteousness. In this context *ṣdq* is synonymous with *'ānî* and *'eḇyôn*.[61] The poor person has not violated the fellowship and thus remains *ṣaddîq* (Ps. 140:13-14[12-13]; Prov. 31:9; Am. 2:6; 5:12; cf. also Ps. 72:2; 103:6; Zeph. 2:3).[62] The king too is *ṣaddîq* and *'ānî* in his relationship to God (Zech. 9:9).

---

57. → נקה *nāqâ*, IX, 557ff.

58. See R. B. Y. Scott, "Wise and Foolish, Righteous and Wicked," *Studies in the Religion of Ancient Israel. SVT* 23 (1972), 146-65.

59. → חכם *ḥāḵam (chākham)*, IV, 372.

60. M. Sæbø, "חכם *ḥkm* to be wise," *TLOT*, I, 419.

61. → ענה *'ānâ*; → אביון *'eḇyôn ('ebhyôn)*, I, 27ff.

62. See H. Donner, "Die soziale Botschaft der Propheten im Lichte der Gesellshaftsordnung in Israel," *OrAnt* 2 (1963) 229-45.

2. *Antonyms.* Fahlgren has exhaustively studied the antonyms of *ṣdq*,[63] among which → רשׁע *rāšā'* is especially prominent. The *rāšā'* hates the *ṣaddîq* (Ps. 34:22[21]). It is especially in the Psalms and wisdom literature that the *ṣaddîq* and *rāšā'* appear as antitheses.[64] The functions of masc. *reša'* and fem. *riš'â* recall the distinction between *ṣeḏeq* and *ṣ*ᵉ*ḏāqâ*.[65]

IV. 1. *Verb.* The verb occurs 41 times, and in its 22 occurrences in the qal it means "be just/righteous, emerge as just/righteous." Subjects include God (Ps. 51:6[4]), God's *mišpāṭîm* (Ps. 19:10[9]), or people. The context often involves a dispute or comparison between two parties; the party who wins, who is right or is shown to be right, is righteous. A person can be in the right over against another person (Gen. 38:26; Ezk. 16:52), though not before God (Isa. 43:9,26), "for no one living is righteous" before God (Ps. 143:2). Thus does the book of Job repeatedly ask whether Job or any person can be righteous before God (e.g., Job 4:17). In relation to God, a person can be righteous only in or through God (Isa. 45:25).

According to Dnl. 8:14, the sanctuary will ultimately be "justified" (niphal), i.e., "shall be restored to its rightful state."

Of the 5 occurrences in the piel, 3 (Jer. 3:11; Ezk. 16:51,52) describe how the sins of "false Judah" allow "faithless Israel" to appear righteous. Job is chastised for having claimed to be in the right before God (Job 32:2), and Elihu exhorts Job, "speak, for I desire to justify you" (33:32). These passages are concerned primarily with situational justification or righteousness.

The hiphil *hiṣdîq* occurs 12 times and means "declare righteous, help someone to their right, exonerate." The subject is generally a judge or persons who by virtue of their office are able to confirm that someone is in the right or can help such a person establish that right (Ex. 23:7; Dt. 25:1; 2 S. 15:4; 1 K. 8:32; Job 27:5; Prov. 17:15; Isa. 5:23). The poor and oppressed can legitimately claim their right to be "justified," in which case *ṣdq* hiphil can also mean "deliver, help" (Ps. 82:3; Isa. 50:8; 53:11; Dnl. 12:3). The verb is used in the hithpael in Gen. 44:16: "How can we justify [i.e., clear] ourselves?"

2. *ṣeḏeq.* The masc. subst. *ṣeḏeq* occurs 119 times and refers to the ordered, divine principle, though it can also evoke the notion of active intervention, an activity evident in many passages. God's righteousness (also in the sense of "deliverance" or "vindication") is near (Isa. 51:5); it both precedes and follows him (Ps. 85:14[13]). Yahweh will make the psalmist's vindication shine like the light (Ps. 37:6). The people's own vindication will go before them (Isa. 58:8). Such righteousness will even look down from the sky (Ps. 85:12[11]), and Yahweh will "let the skies rain down righteousness" (Isa.

---

63. Fahlgren, 1-77.

64. C. van Leeuwen, "רשׁע *rš'* to be impious/guilty," *TLOT*, III, 1262-63; → כסל *kāsal*, VII, 264ff.; → כרת *kāraṯ*, VII, 339ff.; see IV.5 below.

65. In this regard see B. Johnson, "Der Bedeutungsunterschied zwischen *ṣädäq* und *ṣedaqa*," *ASTI* 11 (1978) 31-39.

45:8; Hos. 10:12). Righteousness will be the belt around the king's waist (Isa. 11:5) and will rise up to meet King Cyrus (Isa. 41:2). All these examples evoke the notion of dynamic activity.

Other passages emphasize what is already firmly established and dependable. Righteousness is said to have lodged in the city (Isa. 1:21). Even the foundation of God's throne is made of *ṣeḏeq* and *mišpāṭ* (Ps. 89:15[14]; 97:2;[66] cf. also Prov. 25:5; 16:12 with *ṣᵉḏāqâ;* 20:28 with *ḥeseḏ*).

These two aspects often overlap. When God's right hand is filled with *ṣeḏeq* (Ps. 48:11[10]), when heaven or the psalmist tells of God's righteousness (35:28; 40:10[9]; 50:6; 97:6), the reference is to God's beneficent and saving order.

The king and judge should love *ṣeḏeq* and judge with *ṣeḏeq* (Dt. 1:16; Ps. 45:8[7]; Prov. 31:9).[67] It is noteworthy that *ṣeḏeq* can be introduced not only with prepositions (see below), but also as a direct object. In such cases the accusative can be understood adverbially, e.g., in the sense of "judging in a *ṣeḏeq* fashion"; such usage can also mean that *ṣeḏeq* itself is the content of the action and not just the principle according to which the action is carried out.

When Ps. 119 repeatedly describes God's commandments and ordinances as *ṣeḏeq,* it is probably referring first of all to Yahweh's established order. The term *ṣeḏeq* describes what Yahweh appoints (Ps. 119:138), hears (Ps. 17:1), and speaks (Isa. 45:19); what one knows (Isa. 51:7), seeks (Zeph. 2:3), learns (Prov. 1:3; Isa. 26:9,10), understands (Prov. 2:9), and says (Ps. 52:5[3]; 58:2[1]); Prov. 12:17). Striving for *ṣeḏeq* also includes the aspect of claiming what is rightfully due; as a legitimate claim of this sort, *ṣeḏeq* is based both on the God-given order of things and on his saving activity. One should pursue justice (Dt. 16:20; Isa. 51:1), clothe oneself in righteousness (Ps. 132:9; Job 29:14), do right (Ps. 15:2; 119:121; Isa. 64:4[5]), and ascribe *ṣeḏeq* to the Creator (Job 36:3) by describing both God and his actions with appropriate respect (cf. Isa. 62:2, which parallels *ṣeḏeq* and *kāḇôḏ*). Both the new king (Jer. 23:6) and the city of Jerusalem (Jer. 33:16) are given the name *yhwh ṣiḏqēnû,* "Yahweh is our righteousness," perhaps in contrast to the name of King Zedekiah.[68] Yahweh is the salvation and deliverance of his people, but also their rightful portion. The oppression of the poor and the violation of their *ṣeḏeq* and *mišpāṭ* (Eccl. 5:7[8]) simultaneously disrupts God's order, obstructs salvation, and pushes aside the legitimate claims of the poor. Ps. 85:11(10) describes the antithetical, harmonious situation in which *ḥeseḏ* and *'ᵉmeṯ* meet and *ṣeḏeq* and *šālôm* kiss each other.

The term *ṣeḏeq* is often used in prepositional phrases, generally with *bᵉ;* e.g., Yahweh or a person (often the king) judges *bᵉṣeḏeq* (Lev. 19:15; Ps. 9:9[8]; 72:2; 96:13; 98:9; Isa. 11:4). Such judgment is also associated with *kᵉ,* "Judge me [vindicate me], O Yahweh, my God, *kᵉṣiḏqᵉḵā,* according to your righteousness" (Ps. 35:24).

---

66. → כסא *kissē',* VII, 232ff.

67. See K. Whitelam, *The Just King. JSOTSup* 12 (1979).

68. J. J. Stamm, "Der Name Zedekia," *De la Tôrah au Messie. FS H. Cazelles. AOAT* 212 (1981), 227-35.

Supplicants praise Yahweh "due to his righteousness" (7:18[17]) and hope and anticipate that Yahweh will judge them according to their righteousness (7:9[8]; 18:21,25[20,24]); here *tōm* and *bōr,* "innocence" and "purity," are often enumerated as parallels of human righteousness. In such prepositional phrases, *b^e^* generally alludes to the activity of *ṣeḏeq,* while *k^e^* emphasizes *ṣeḏeq* as the existing order. Similarly, *ḥeseḏ, b^e^rāḵâ,* and *raḥ^a^mîm* are used with both *b^e^* and *k^e^,* while *'^e^meṯ, '^e^mûnâ, yešaʿ, y^e^šûʿâ,* and *šālôm* are associated with *b^e^* but never with *k^e^.* The activity in *b^e^* + *ṣeḏeq* is involved, e.g., when Yahweh arouses Cyrus in righteousness (Isa. 45:13), when he answers supplicants (Ps. 65:6[5]), and when he takes Israel as his wife forever (Hos. 2:21[19]; probably to be understood as *beth pretii*[69]). A person can behold God's face in righteousness (Ps. 17:15) and summon a person before the court in righteousness (Isa. 59:4).

The expression *b^e^* + *ṣeḏeq* can also refer to the established order. A person should speak in righteousness (Prov. 8:8), the king's throne should be established in righteousness (Prov. 25:5). On the other hand, righteous people can also perish in their righteousness (Eccl. 7:15; some scholars describe this usage as *beth concessivum,* "perish despite their righteousness"[70]).

In Jer. 22:13 the prophet accuses the king of having built his house *b^e^lō'-ṣeḏeq* and his upper rooms *b^e^lō'-mišpāṭ.* Just as with *mišpāṭ,* the negated form of *ṣeḏeq* indicates not only unrighteousness as such, but also the exaggerated, excessive element that is so at odds with the correct, established order of things.

Other prepositions are used as well. The righteous can turn from *(min)* their righteousness (Ezk. 3:20). A king should reign *l^e^ṣeḏeq,* "in righteousness" (Isa. 32:1).[71] One can even say that *mišpāṭ* will return to *(ʿaḏ) ṣeḏeq* (Ps. 94:15). Yahweh acts *l^e^maʿan ṣiḏqô,* "for the sake of his righteousness" (Isa. 42:21).

A whole series of passages associates *ṣeḏeq* with other substs.: *mō'z^e^nê-ṣeḏeq,* "honest balances" (Job 31:6; Ezk. 45:10; cf. also Lev. 19:36; Dt. 25:15); *ziḇḥê-ṣeḏeq,* "right sacrifices" (Dt. 33:19; Ps. 4:6[5]; 51:21[19]). Construct expressions with *ṣeḏeq* include *māqôm,* "place of righteousness" (Eccl. 3:16); *nāweh,* "abode of righteousness" (Job 8:6; Jer. 31:23; 50:7), city (Isa. 1:26), oaks (Isa. 61:3), ways (Ps. 23:3), gates (Ps. 118:19), and lips (Prov. 16:13). The expression *mišpaṭ-ṣeḏeq* (Dt. 16:18; Ps. 119:160) refers to judgment on the basis of righteousness. God's own *mišp^e^ṭê-ṣeḏeq* are his righteous judgments or commandments (Ps. 119:7,62,106,164; Isa. 58:2). Other combinations include the right hand of God's righteousness (Isa. 41:10) and his righteous promise (Ps. 119:123). Reference to Yahweh as *šōpēṭ ṣeḏeq* (Ps. 9:5[4]; Jer. 11:20) can be understood as "righteous judge" or as "judge who judges righteousness." Combinations such as *'^e^lōhê ṣiḏqî,* "God of my righteousness" (Ps. 4:2[1]), and *ḥ^a^pēṣê ṣiḏqî,* "those who desire my vindication" (Ps. 35:27), show that such righteousness or vindication is indeed something to which the supplicant can

69. See Kellenberger, 162ff.

70. F. Piotti, "Osservazioni su alcuni problemi esegetici nel libro dell'Ecclesiaste," *BeO* 22 (1980) 243-53.

71. See J. V. Olley, "Notes on Isaiah 32:1, 45:19,23 and 63:1," *VT* 33 (1983) 446-53.

make a legitimate claim, but that at the same time the basis for this claim is not in the supplicant, but in God.

In Ps. 45:5(4) the king rides victoriously for *ʾemeṯ* and *ʿanwâ-ṣeḏeq*. The second expression can perhaps be understood adverbially in the sense of "appropriate humility" or as "wronged right."[72]

3. *ṣᵉḏāqâ*. The fem. subst. *ṣᵉḏāqâ* occurs 157 times and often goes a step further than *ṣeḏeq* in concretizing the underlying notion,[73] possibly a result of its use, unlike *ṣeḏeq*, in the plural *(ṣᵉḏāqôṯ)* in reference to actions actually manifesting righteousness.

Yahweh's own *ṣᵉḏāqâ* is described as an entity with widespread and enduring stability. It is like the mighty mountains (Ps. 36:7[6]), reaching even as high as the heavens (71:19). It will endure forever (111:3; 112:3,9; Isa. 51:8) and will never cease (Isa. 51:6). Indeed, it is *ṣeḏeq* forever (Ps. 119:142). Such *ṣᵉḏāqâ* can also enter into a positive relation to God as an independent entity in its own right. It is present with him and only with him (Isa. 45:24; Dnl. 9:7). He puts it on like a breastplate (Isa. 59:17), he does not violate it (Job 37:23); indeed, he loves it (Ps. 11:7; 33:5). It can also be found in wisdom (Prov. 8:18).

Above all, however, *ṣᵉḏāqâ* refers to Yahweh's positive and beneficent intervention. It is for the people (Dt. 6:25; 24:13), comes forth from the mouth of Yahweh (Isa. 45:23), is near (46:13; 51:6), is the people's vindication from Yahweh (54:17), and upholds Yahweh himself when he intervenes (59:16). Not surprisingly, the people lament when it is absent (59:9,14). Such justice can also be executed (Dt. 33:21). Yahweh performs *ṣᵉḏāqôṯ* for his people (1 S. 12:7; Ps. 103:6). He makes righteousness his plummet (Isa. 28:17), fills Zion with it (33:5), appoints it as the people's taskmaster (60:17), makes it spring up (61:11), bestows it on the king's son (Ps. 72:1), and reveals it before the nations (Ps. 98:2).

In Gen. 15:6 Yahweh reckons *ṣᵉḏāqâ* to Abraham.[74] A similar passage reckons Phinehas's intercession as righteousness (*liṣḏāqâ*, Ps. 106:31). In Gen. 15:6 *ṣᵉḏāqâ* is used without a preposition, showing that the fem. suf. in *wayyaḥšᵉḇehā* can be colored by *ṣᵉḏāqâ*.[75] This construction along with the consecutive verb form *wᵉheʾᵉmîn* emphasize the divine action; God made promises to him, he believed, and God reckoned it to him as righteousness.

A new understanding of this verse has emerged that takes Abraham as the consistent

72. J. S. M. Mulder, *Studies on Psalm 45* (Nijmegen, 1972), 106ff.

73. See 4 below.

74. Concerning the verse's construction and content, see G. von Rad, "Faith Reckoned as Righteousness," *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays* (Eng. trans. 1968) 125-30; H. Wildberger, "'Glauben' im AT," *ZTK* 65 (1968) 129-59; Stendebach; D. H. van Daalen, "Paul's Doctrine of Justification and Its OT Roots," *Studia Evangelica* 6 (1969/73) 556-70, esp. 563; H. H. Schmid, "Gerechtigkeit und Glaube: Genesis 15:1-6 und sein biblisch-theologischer Kontext," *EvT* 40 (1980) 396-420; H. Gross, "'Rechtfertigung' im AT: Bibeltheologische Beobachtungen," *Kontinuität und Einheit. FS F. Mussner* (Freiburg, 1981), 17-29; and esp. → חשב *ḥāšaḇ*, V, 228ff.; also → אמן *ʾāman*, esp. I, 305.

75. H. S. Nyberg, *Hebreisk grammatik* (Uppsala, 1952), §84q.

subject throughout the verse.[76] That is, Abraham believed the Lord and reckoned it (i.e., what the Lord had promised) to him as (a manifestation of his) righteousness. Elements militating against this view include especially the consecutive verb form and the divine name immediately before the verb "and he reckoned," where "he" can more naturally refer to God.[77]

In a whole series of passages, especially within wisdom literature, it is difficult to determine whether *ṣᵉḏāqâ* is an expression of divine or human activity. After the Spirit is poured out, righteousness will dwell in the fruitful field (Isa. 32:16). Righteousness delivers from death (Prov. 10:2; 11:4), guards those whose ways are upright (13:6), and exalts a nation (14:34). In one instance the earth itself is the subject that causes salvation *(yešaʿ)* to spring up and *ṣᵉḏāqâ* to sprout forth (Isa. 45:8).

Yahweh's *ṣᵉḏāqâ* is a positive, beneficent activity directed toward human beings, who are then its recipients (Ps. 24:5). The appropriate human response is to confess, extol, and praise Yahweh's righteousness (Jgs. 5:11; Ps. 22:32[31]; 40:11[10]; 51:16[14]; 71:15ff.; 88:13[12]; 145:7; Mic. 6:5; 7:9). At the same time, God's salvific intervention becomes the *ṣᵉḏāqâ* of those who receive it; "Yahweh has brought forth our *ṣᵉḏāqôṯ;* come, let us declare in Zion the work of Yahweh our God" (Jer. 51:10). If Israel would but pay attention to Yahweh's commandments, its *šālôm* would be like a river, and its *ṣᵉḏāqâ* like the waves of the sea (Isa. 48:18). Another metaphor compares *ṣᵉḏāqâ* to an ever-flowing stream (Am. 5:24).

The exercise of human righteousness is generally expressed with the verb *ʿāśâ* (about 20 times, often together with *mišpāṭ*) such that people "do" or "perform" righteousness (and justice). Other verbs include "fill" (Isa. 33:5), "sow" (Prov. 11:18), and "pursue" (Prov. 15:9; 21:21). A person's *ṣᵉḏāqâ* is important for others, for one's fellows (Job 35:8); it keeps the ways of the righteous straight and saves them (Prov. 11:5,6). The *ṣᵉḏāqâ* that people exercise ultimately returns to them (Ezk. 3; 18; 33). Subjects in this sense include even God (1 S. 26:23; Job 33:26).

People's *ṣᵉḏāqâ* can also be evaluated negatively as either missing entirely or, if present, as a negative entity. "I will concede your righteousness and your works *(maʿᵃśeh),* but they will not help you" (Isa. 57:12). "All our *ṣᵉḏāqôṯ* are like a filthy cloth" (64:5[6]). These passages refer to the righteousness people generate from within themselves without the proper relationship to God.

In a number of passages *ṣᵉḏāqâ* has the extended meaning "legitimate claim." Jacob received sheep and goats of a certain color as his wage, and a check would show his *ṣᵉḏāqâ* (Gen. 30:33). Although his righteousness naturally derives from his having genuinely kept to the agreement, his *ṣᵉḏāqâ* is also, in a completely concrete sense, the livestock he now legitimately possesses. Mephibosheth has no further rights: "What further right *(ṣᵉḏāqâ)* have I, then, to appeal to the king?" (2 S. 19:29[28]). Nehemiah

---

76. Already proposed by Ramban as early as the 13th century, more recently by L. Gaston, "Abraham and the Righteousness of God," *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 2 (1980) 39-68; and M. Oeming, "Ist Genesis 15:6 ein Beleg für die Anrechnung des Glaubens zur Gerechtigkeit?" *ZAW* 95 (1983) 182-97.

77. B. Johnson, "Who Reckoned Righteousness to Whom?" *SEÅ* 51/52 (1986/87) 108-15.

turns away the neighboring peoples with the words, "You have no portion or *ṣᵉḏāqâ* or memorial in Jerusalem" (Neh. 2:20). Those who deprive the innocent of their rights (Isa. 5:23) forfeit their own rights within society. Amos commensurately reproaches those who turn *mišpāṭ* into wormwood and trample *ṣᵉḏāqâ* underfoot (Am. 5:7). Isa. 10:22 is a difficult passage: "Destruction is decreed, overflowing with *ṣᵉḏāqâ*." The compressed construction allows various translations.[78]

As was the case with *ṣeḏeq*, the most frequent preposition used with *ṣᵉḏāqâ* is *bᵉ*. In the larger sense, God shows himself holy by righteousness (Isa. 5:16) and indeed is God in this sense (Zech. 8:8). Furthermore, however, in such righteousness God also speaks (Isa. 63:1), guides (Ps. 5:9[8]), delivers and saves (31:2[1]; 71:2), "gives me life" (119:40), "gives ear to my supplications" (143:1), and "helps me" (143:11). In this expression as well, *ṣᵉḏāqâ* often appears as an independent entity, and the demarcation between divine and human *ṣᵉḏāqâ* again becomes more fluid. In Zion those who repent will be redeemed by *ṣᵉḏāqâ* (Isa. 1:27); both the throne and the people will be firmly established with *ṣᵉḏāqâ* (Prov. 16:12; Isa. 9:6[7]; 54:14). A person should walk and invoke the name of God in *ṣᵉḏāqâ* (1 K. 3:6; Isa. 48:1; Jer. 4:2). In *ṣᵉḏāqâ* the mountains and hills yield *šālôm* (Ps. 72:3). "Better is a little with *ṣᵉḏāqâ* than large income *bᵉlō' mišpāṭ*" (Prov. 16:8). Offerings should be presented in *ṣᵉḏāqâ* (Mal. 3:3). The people are exalted in Yahweh's *ṣᵉḏāqâ* (Ps. 89:17[16]), while their adversaries cannot "come into it" (Ps. 69:28[27]), an expression in which *ṣᵉḏāqâ* is understood almost as a sphere. Righteousness is not "present" in people; rather, people live in God's righteousness. Whoever does righteousness will live (Ezk. 18:22), though even the righteousness of Noah, Daniel, and Job could not save the faithless city Jerusalem (Ezk. 14:14ff.). It is not the people's own *ṣᵉḏāqâ*, but rather Yahweh's beneficent intervention that makes the conquest of the land possible; "it is not because of your righteousness or the uprightness of your heart that you are going to occupy their land" (Dt. 9:4ff.).

The prep. *kᵉ* is used in Dnl. 9:16: "O Lord, in view of all your *ṣᵉḏāqôṯ*, let your anger and wrath turn away." God's "righteous acts" are his earlier deeds on behalf of his people. Supplicants can also petition God to act commensurate with their own *ṣᵉḏāqâ* (2 S. 22:21,25; par. Ps. 18:21,25[20,24] *ṣeḏeq;* cf. also 1 K. 8:32). The prep. *min* is also used with *ṣᵉḏāqâ*. A person can be far "from" *ṣᵉḏāqâ* (Isa. 46:12), and a righteous person can even turn away "from" that righteousness (Ezk. 18:24,26; 33:18). The prep. *lᵉ* is used in Ps. 106:31 (see above). One can sow *liṣḏāqâ*, and the rain comes *liṣḏāqâ* (Hos. 10:12; Joel 2:23). Here *ṣᵉḏāqâ* refers to growth and is almost synonymous with *šālôm* and *bᵉrāḵâ* (or is Joel actually thinking of the established order in the sense of "at the right time"?). The prep. *'al* is used twice in reference to "trusting in one's righteousness and yet committing iniquity" (Ezk. 33:13), and to "presenting a supplication on the ground of one's righteousness" (Dnl. 9:18).

Construct expressions include references to "effects" or consequences (Isa. 32:17),

---

78. See J. G. McConville, "Ezra-Nehemiah and the Fulfillment of Prophecy," *VT* 36 (1986) 205-24, esp. 220.

a robe (Isa. 61:10), branch (Jer. 33:15), fruit (Am. 6:12), sun (Mal. 3:20[4:2]), path or way (Prov. 8:20; 12:28; 16:31) of "righteousness." In the expression *kēn-ṣᵉḏāqâ* (Prov. 11:19), *ṣᵉḏāqâ* is probably meant adverbially in the sense of "steadfast in righteousness."

4. *Distinction between ṣeḏeq and ṣᵉḏāqâ.* Hence the semantic fields of *ṣeḏeq* and *ṣᵉḏāqâ* do not completely coincide. Although the two terms are indeed often used synonymously, *ṣᵉḏāqâ* is more often involved in clear concrete references and as a result, unlike *ṣeḏeq*, can also be used in the plural.

O. Procksch has articulated this distinction, taking as his point of departure similar distinctions in other word pairs and comparing the relationship between *ṣeḏeq* and *ṣᵉḏāqâ* to that between *ḥēṭ'* and *ḥᵃṭā'â*, namely, as one between an objective term and a subjective disposition toward it.[79] In this sense he describes *ṣeḏeq* as "order" and *ṣᵉḏāqâ* as "integration, incorporation." A. Jepsen then concludes that *ṣeḏeq* refers to the proper order, *ṣᵉḏāqâ* to the appropriate behavior within that order.[80] Only in the later period does *ṣeḏeq* assume the function of *ṣᵉḏāqâ* when the latter becomes more concrete. Justesen, Scullion, and Schmid present similar views. Schmid draws from Jepsen's work in suggesting that this order is based above all on *ṣeḏeq;* i.e., *ṣeḏeq* represents the correct, God-given, salvific order of the world, and *ṣᵉḏāqâ* the proper, salvific demeanor commensurate with that order, including within the administration of justice.[81] For Crüsemann (cf. also Michel), *ṣeḏeq* is an abstraction or a quality, *ṣᵉḏāqâ* a deed or, perhaps better, an action. The Qumran texts also seem to recognize this distinction (Betz). Jepsen's and others' arguments have also been supported by B. Johnson.[82]

Although *ṣeḏeq* and *ṣᵉḏāqâ* are in many instances interchangeable, they cannot really be treated as synonyms; *ṣeḏeq* evokes the notion of correctness and order, while *ṣᵉḏāqâ* emphasizes action and activity rather than condition. In this sense *ṣᵉḏāqâ* represents *ṣeḏeq* functionally.

Furthermore, *ṣeḏeq* is often associated with God. His right hand is filled with *ṣeḏeq* (Ps. 48:11[10]; cf. in this regard Isa. 41:10; Jer. 50:7; Job 8:6), and the gates of *ṣeḏeq* (Ps. 118:19) are parallel to Yahweh's own gate. The people as "oaks of *ṣeḏeq*" (Isa. 61:3) are called "plantings of Yahweh." The very foundations of Yahweh's throne are *ṣeḏeq* and *mišpāṭ* (Ps. 89:15[14]).

By contrast, *ṣᵉḏāqâ* is often associated with movement, and can even be compared with flowing water (Isa. 48:18; Am. 5:24) and growth (Ps. 72:3; Prov. 11:18; Isa. 61:11; Joel 2:23; Am. 5:7; 6:12). Metaphorically *ṣeḏeq* is often identified with the blessing that comes from heaven, while *ṣᵉḏāqâ* manifests itself in the earth's fertility.

---

79. Procksch, *Theologie des ATs,* 569.

80. "צדק und צדקה im AT," *Gottes Wort und Gottes Land. FS H. W. Hertzberg* (Göttingen, 1965), 78-89 = idem, *Der Herr ist Gott. Aufsätze zur Wissenschaft vom AT* (Berlin, 1978), 221-29.

81. *Gerechtigkeit als Weltordnung.*

82. Johnson, *ASTI* 11 (1978) 31-39.

"Let the skies rain down *ṣeḏeq* . . . let the earth open . . . and let it cause *ṣ*ᵉ*ḏāqâ* to sprout up also" (Isa. 45:8). "Sow for yourselves *ṣ*ᵉ*ḏāqâ;* reap *ḥeseḏ* . . . for it is time to seek Yahweh, that he may come and rain *ṣeḏeq* upon you" (Hos. 10:12). Similarly, "*ḥeseḏ* and *'*ᵉ*meṯ* will meet; *ṣeḏeq* and *šālôm* will kiss each other. *'*ᵉ*meṯ* will spring up from the ground, and *ṣeḏeq* will look down from the sky. Yahweh will give what is good, and our land will yield its increase. *ṣeḏeq* will go before him, and will make a path for his steps" (Ps. 85:11-14[10-13]). Cf. also Ps. 65, which describes God's *ṣeḏeq* (v. 6[5]) also as a harvest blessing.

Especially in metaphorical language, masc. *ṣeḏeq* is clearly associated with heaven and rain, fem. *ṣ*ᵉ*ḏāqâ* more with the earth and its fertility, suggesting, of course, that the background to such usage might be found in earlier Canaanite usage. What is then striking, however, is that Yahweh, Israel's God, is not identified more closely with one of the two terms, e.g., with *ṣeḏeq* such that an individual or the people might then respond with *ṣ*ᵉ*ḏāqâ*. Instead, Yahweh is associated equally with both *ṣeḏeq* and *ṣ*ᵉ*ḏāqâ*. He is not only the guarantor of the principle of *ṣeḏeq*, he also actively intervenes and implements *ṣ*ᵉ*ḏāqâ*.

5. *ṣaddîq*. With 206 occurrences, the adj. *ṣaddîq* is the most frequently occurring derivative of the root *ṣdq*. It can be associated with both God and human beings, but not really with things or actions. Only in Dt. 4:8 are God's *ḥuqqîm* and *mišpāṭîm* called *ṣaddîqîm*.

When God is described as *ṣaddîq*, the context generally involves actions through which he demonstrates his righteousness. It is not a character trait inhering in God that is described, but rather his beneficent intervention. God is a just and saving God (Isa. 45:21). In this context *ṣaddîq* parallels *ḥannûn, raḥûm,* and *ḥāsîḏ* (Ps. 112:4; 116:5; 145:17). The evil of the wicked is brought to an end, and the rights of the righteous are established (Ps. 7:10,12[9,11]; 11:7; 129:4; Jer. 20:12). The just God acts righteously when he chastises the people for their wickedness and tries to prompt them to repent (Zeph. 3:5). People should praise God by confessing him as "just and upright" (Dt. 32:4; Ps. 119:137; Isa. 41:26). The accused can acknowledge a plaintiff as *ṣaddîq* and confess their own guilt (Ex. 9:27; Jer. 12:1); indeed, chastisement often prompts the people to make such a confession (2 Ch. 12:6; Ezr. 9:15; Neh. 9:8,33; Lam. 1:18; Dnl. 9:14), a confession acknowledging that Yahweh is in the right and that the people bear all the guilt. Yet precisely because God remains *ṣaddîq*, the people can hope to be forgiven and reestablished. Jer. 23:5 promises a *ṣemaḥ ṣaddîq*, a righteous (or "legitimate") branch,[83] who will rule as king with wisdom and will implement *mišpāṭ* and *ṣ*ᵉ*ḏāqâ*. Zech. 9:9 describes the king as *ṣaddîq, nôšā'*, "victorious," and *'ānî*, "humble." A king is *ṣaddîq* when he has the right relationship with both God and his subjects (2 S. 23:3).

Noah was called *ṣaddîq*, more specifically *tāmîm*, and was a person who walked

---

83. J. Swetnam, "Some Observations on the Background of צדיק in Jeremia 23,5a," *Bibl* 46 (1965) 29-40.

with God (Gen. 6:9; cf. also v. 22; 7:1). Indeed, his righteousness can also be viewed from the perspective of election on behalf of the world.[84] Abimelech is *ṣaddîq* because he acted in the integrity of his heart and the innocence of his hands (Gen. 20:4-5). Because the people did not participate in Jehu's conspiracy, Jehu tells them, "You are *ṣaddîqîm*" (2 K. 10:9). David is *ṣaddîq* when he spares Saul (1 S. 24:17-18), and Ishbaal (Ish-bosheth) when he, innocent, is murdered in his own house (2 S. 4:11). The *'eḇeḏ* is *ṣaddîq* when through his knowledge he "makes many righteous" (Isa. 53:11).[85]

Several passages describe what it means to be *ṣaddîq*, and although standards are presented in the Decalog, in the gate liturgies Ps. 15 and 24, and in Job 31 and Ezk. 18:5ff. (cf. also Ezk. 3; 33), the descriptions vary widely. There are no fixed lists as such, but rather only collections of examples. Such enumerations often begin with the relationship to God, e.g., in the form of a rejection of foreign gods, and end with summary exhortations such as "walk upright," "keep God's commandments," etc., and in this sense *ṣaddîq* can characterize the conduct of a person's life (Job 17:9; Ps. 1:6; Prov. 2:20; 4:18; 20:7; Eccl. 7:15; Isa. 26:7). Hab. 2:4 associates "righteousness" and "life" much along these lines: "Their spirit [the Chaldean oppressors] is not right in them, but the *ṣaddîq* lives by his *'ᵉmûnâ*";[86] here *'ᵉmeṯ* (Ezk. 18:9) or *'ᵉmûnâ* is the basic disposition manifesting itself in dependability and loyalty (cf. also Prov. 21:21; Ezk. 33:12).

Gen. 18:23ff. and then several passages in wisdom literature use *ṣaddîq* with no further qualifying terms. The hearts and thoughts of the righteous focus on what is right (Prov. 11:9; 12:5; 15:28). The righteous speak what is right (Ps. 37:30; Prov. 10:11,20,21,31,32) and detest lies (Prov. 13:5). Their fruit is a tree of life (Prov. 11:30). In court they support the just causes (Ps. 1:5; 141:5; Prov. 12:26; 21:12,15; Ezk. 23:45). They are compassionate and generous, helping the oppressed (Ps. 37:21; Prov. 21:26; 29:7) and even animals (Prov. 12:10). They rejoice in Yahweh and take their refuge in him (Ps. 64:11[10]), and for that reason are able to stand firm, confident and undeterred (Prov. 10:25; 14:32; 28:1); hence the fathers of the righteous "greatly rejoice" over them (23:24).

The notion of *ṣaddîq* is often contrasted with *rāšā'*,[87] and the two terms together can even function as an expression of totality, e.g., when Yahweh says he will destroy both the *ṣaddîq* and the *rāšā'* (Ezk. 21:8[3]). According to Ecclesiastes (7:15; 8:14; 9:2), the *ṣaddîq* often fare exactly as do the *rāšā'*, i.e., the author sees no mechanical relationship between righteousness and good fortune. Nor are any persons so righteous that they do not sin (7:20), and the shadow of righteousness, of course, is always self-

84. M. Clark, "The Righteousness of Noah," *VT* 21 (1971) 261-80.

85. See H. Simian-Yofre, "La teodicea del Deuteroisaías," *Bibl* 62 (1981) 55-72.

86. אמן *'āman*, I, 318-19; cf. W. T. in der Smitten, "Habakuk 2,4 als prophetische Definition des Gerechten," *Bausteine biblischer Theologie. FS G. J. Botterweck. BBB* 50 (1977), 291-300; J. M. Scott, "A New Approach to Habakkuk II 4-5A," *VT* 35 (1985) 330-40; A. H. J. Gunneweg, "Habakuk und das Problem des leidenden צדיק," *ZAW* 98 (1986) 400-15.

87. See W. S. Prinsloo, "Psalm 1, die ṣaddiqīm en die rᵉša'im," *NGTT* 22 (1981) 80-90.

righteousness (Job 32:1). Even while abiding in God's own hand, the righteous are not protected from misfortune, but rather are continually exposed to the assaults of evil, either under the guise of the law itself (Ex. 23:8; Dt. 16:19; Prov. 17:15,26; 18:5; 24:15; Isa. 5:23; 29:21; Am. 2:6; 5:12) or in the form of outright persecution by the wicked (Job 12:4; 34:17; Ps. 31:19[18]; 34:22[21]; 37:12,32; 94:21; Prov. 25:26; Lam. 4:13; Ezk. 13:22; Hab. 1:4). In such situations the righteous turn to God in lament and prayer (Isa. 57:1; Hab. 1:3-4), even though the response is frequently seen precisely in a testing of the righteous (Ps. 11:5).[88]

6. *ṣdq min.* The construction *ṣdq min* is often used comparatively in the sense of "more righteous than," though such use involves a comparison of two juxtaposed parties rather than a situation in which both are measured against some standard.[89] The pertinent question is then, who in such situations is actually the righteous person?

In Gen. 38:26 Tamar confronts her father-in-law Judah, and with the words *ṣāḏ^eqâ mimmennî* he admits that she rather than he is in the right. So also is David more righteous than Saul (1 S. 24:18[17]), and Abner and Amasa more righteous than Joab (1 K. 2:32). Although the comparison between the two apostate sisters Israel and Judah (Jer. 3:11; Ezk. 16:51-52) certainly suggests that one or the other is to be judged more righteous, the judgment "Israel is more righteous than Judah" means rather that the severity of Judah's own sins merely makes its sister Israel "appear righteous."

Job 4:17 poses the rhetorical question whether mortals can be righteous before God, and in 32:2 and 35:2 Job is accused of having claimed to be righteous before God.[90] If Job is serious about winning this competition, he must also be prepared to maintain and renew all of creation. Lk. 18:14 apparently contains an NT version of *ṣdq min.*

V. Function.

1. *Covenant.* The notion behind *ṣdq* is closely related to → ברית *b^erîṯ* in its reference to demeanor commensurate with the covenant.[91] Following the study by N. Glueck,[92] *ḥeseḏ* was understood as the designation for the positive content of the covenant, a view

---

88. See V.4 below.

89. *GK,* §133b,c.

90. See in this regard G. Fohrer, "The Righteous Man in Job 31," in J. L. Crenshaw and J. F. Willis, eds., *Essays in OT Ethics* (New York, 1974), 1-22; G. Many, *Der Rechtsstreit mit Gott im Hiobbuch* (Sangmélima, Cameroon, 1971); B. Halpern, "Yhwh's Summary Justice in Job XIV 20," *VT* 28 (1978) 472-74.

91. Cf. E. Nielsen, "The Righteous and the Wicked in Habaqquq," *ST* 6 (1952) 54-78; W. R. Roehrs, "Der alttestamentliche Bund und die Rechtfertigung durch den Glauben," *Lutherischer Rundblick* 12 (1964) 154-74; J. E. Eggleton, "The Ethical Import of Select Theological Concepts Reflected in the Thought of the Early Eighth Century B.C. Hebrew Prophets" (diss., Univ. of Iowa, 1973); P. Buis, *La notion d'alliance dans l'AT. LD* 88 (1976); Sanders, 198ff.; D. J. McCarthy, *Treaty and Covenant. AnBibl* 21A (²1978).

92. *Das Wort hesed im alttestamentlichen Sprachgebrauche als menschliche und göttliche gemeinschaftgemässe Verhaltungsweise. BZAW* 47 (1927; ²1961) = *Ḥesed in the Bible* (Eng. trans. 1967).

modified in more recent studies.[93] The term *ḥeseḏ*, however, not only refers to the content of the covenant, but also functions as a parallel to *beriṯ*. Furthermore, recent scholars' demarcation and dating of various understandings of the covenant is no longer as unequivocal as was earlier the case. These reservations notwithstanding, however, *ḥeseḏ* and *ṣdq* are the most obvious terms used to express positive demeanor within the covenant or in a community or fellowship in the larger sense. The distinction between *ḥeseḏ* and *ṣdq* in this context is that *ḥeseḏ* expresses open, even ebullient generosity, while *ṣdq* describes the form and consequences of positively ordered community relationships and circumstances. Boecker's study laid the foundation for determining how *ṣdq* functions within such regulated community order. He has shown that *ṣaddîq* and *rāšā'* represent the two parties in a legal dispute. Whenever the community or society was endangered, the judge was to determine whose behavior was threatening the inner cohesion of the community. The judge's decision and judgment took the form *'attâ ṣaddîq, hû' rāšā'*, "you are right, he is an evildoer." The guilty party is no longer directly addressed, but is rather mentioned only in the third person as an allusion to his status outside the community. The innocent are "justified" *(hiṣdîq)* insofar as either the judge or the king thwarts all attempts to harm them. Hence those who stand within this community are *ṣaddîq* as long as their lives and demeanor do not violate that community. Those who question the status of others as *ṣaddîq* or seek to rob them of that status show by such action that it is they who are *rāšā'*; as such, they place themselves outside the community.

The OT covenant community acquires its specific character in that God too is a member of the covenant. He demonstrates his righteousness by upholding that covenant (Ps. 111:3,5,9). Of course, God's righteousness is immeasurably greater than all human righteousness, even though both are called *ṣdq*. God demonstrates his righteousness by maintaining both the covenant and, ultimately, creation itself. The appropriate and righteous human response is to live within and commensurate with this God-given community.

Whenever this covenantal relationship between God and human beings is violated, God cannot be the guilty party because right is inseparable from God. Indeed, God is both the origin and guarantor of all righteousness; there is no righteousness apart from him. Hence if God is *ṣaddîq*, human beings are *rāšā'* as long as they are separated from God. As such, they must confess their sins and attest God's own righteousness, "so that you [God] are justified *(tiṣdaq)* in your sentence" (Ps. 51:6[4]).

A breach can occur between God and a person even without that person consciously turning against God or abandoning him. An example is the discussion in Job where this apparent breach is interpreted as a testing of the righteous person.

Naturally enough, the question of the covenant's continued existence and of God's righteousness became a burning issue during the exile. Because God is unchangeably *ṣaddîq*, his salvific *ṣeḏāqâ* continues unabated, and there is thus hope for the future (Jer. 29:11; Lam. 3:22).

---

93. → חסד *ḥeseḏ*, V, 44ff.; cf. K. D. Sakenfeld, *The Meaning of Hesed in the Hebrew Bible: A New Inquiry. HSM* 17 (1978); Kellenberger; see also Sakenfeld, *Faithfulness in Action. OBT* (1985).

2. *Law.* The law with its commandments and ordinances helps ensure that righteousness will indeed function within society. Both *b^e rîṯ* and → תורה *tôrâ* are used to express God's actions, and in this context *ṣdq* and *tôrâ* can be parallel.[94] God manifests his own beneficent righteousness by giving human beings his law, and corresponding human righteousness consists in living in accordance with that law.[95]

The lists in which the law is presented in concrete series of regulations are not uniform;[96] rather, they circumscribe paradigmatically the basic, appropriate relationship with God for which a person should strive in daily life. The *tôrâ* is not just a "law" but also "instruction." One notices that precisely what are called "gate" or "entrance liturgies," when compared to similar Egyptian texts containing both ethical and cultic-ritual stipulations, contain (with the exception of Ezk. 18) exclusively ethical stipulations.[97]

3. *Reconciliation.* Strikingly, righteousness and atonement are not closely related in the OT, apparently because there is no notion that a person can reconcile with God.[98] A righteous life includes but is by no means based on atoning one's sins and impurity through sacrifices and other rituals. Descriptions of righteous persons and their conduct focus primarily on their relation with God and the attendant ethical behavior. If sin disrupts that relationship with God, the first line of action includes a confession of that sin and then forgiveness (Ps. 32; 51). Sacrifices are generally mentioned in connection with concluding vows. Although the righteous do indeed also offer sacrifices (Job 1:1,5), the place of such sacrifices is alongside prayer and praise within the context of worship as an expression of one's relationship with God.

In connection with atonement, *ṣdq* is associated primarily with those who are actually carrying out the atoning action. It is in this sense that Phinehas's intervention is reckoned to him as righteousness (Ps. 106:30-31). Similarly, the servant "shall make

---

94. See III.1 above.

95. Cf. J. M. Myers, *Grace and Torah* (Philadelphia, 1975); H. Gese, "Ps. 50 und das alttestamentliche Gesetzesverständnis," *Rechtfertigung. FS E. Käsemann* (Tübingen, 1976), 57-77; A. Jepsen, "Israel und das Gesetz," *TLZ* 93 (1968) 85-94 = *Der Herr ist Gott: Aufsätze zur Wissenschaft vom AT* (Berlin, 1978), 155-62; R. Martin-Achard, "Brèves remarques sur la signification théologique de la loi selon l'AT," *ETR* 57 (1982) 343-59; G. Braulik, "Gesetz als Evangelium: Rechtfertigung und Begnadigung nach der deuteronomischen Tora," *ZTK* 79 (1982) 127-60 = "Law as Gospel: Justification and Pardon According to the Deuteronomic Torah," *Int* 38 (1984) 5-14.

96. See IV.5 above.

97. M. Weinfeld, "Instructions for Temple Visitors in the Bible and in Ancient Egypt," in S. Israelit-Groll, ed., *Egyptological Studies. ScrHier* 28 (1982), 224-50, esp. 239ff.; cf. already H. Ringgren, *Psalmen. Urban Taschenbücher* 120 (Stuttgart, 1971), 123. Concerning the "entrance liturgies," see also K. Koch, "Tempeleinlassliturgien und Dekaloge," *Studien zur Theologie der alttestamentlichen Überlieferungen. FS G. von Rad* (Neukirchen, 1961), 45-60; M. B. Dick, "Job 31, the Oath of Innocence, and the Sage," *ZAW* 95 (1983) 31-53; S. Steingrimsson, *Tor der Gerechtigkeit. ATS* 22 (1984); E. Otto, "Kultus und Ethos in Jerusalemer Theologie," *ZAW* 98 (1986) 161-79; T. Mettinger, *Namnet och Närvaron. Gudsnamn och gudsbild i Böckernas Bok* (Örebro, 1987), esp. 147-48.

98. → כפר *kipper,* VII, 288ff.

many righteous" by bearing their iniquities (Isa. 53:11). Here the atoning actions are not the condition but rather the expression of righteousness that is then expanded through those actions.

4. *Testing.* The model of the "act-consequence" connection is used to describe the relationship between the righteous and their God. Whenever a person's righteousness does not automatically result in happiness and good fortune, the assumption is that God is testing the person.[99] Yahweh's activities of watching over and upholding the covenant include also testing his covenantal partners.[100] Even if such testing is unpleasant for the covenant partner, its goal is nonetheless the positive maintenance of the covenant itself.

The object of such testing can be either the whole people or an individual, and the testing of the latter can acquire particular significance when the object is to determine that person's status within the community (Am. 9:9). In Isa. 7 King Ahaz is put to the test and does not pass (cf. also Ezk. 9; Zech. 13:8). The acquittal of a righteous person in court is viewed as a test by Yahweh (Ps. 7:9-10[8-9]) that also reveals the distinction between the righteous and the wicked (Ps. 11:5).

Such testing is occasionally even viewed as a special distinction bestowed on the elect that gives the righteous the opportunity to demonstrate their innocence (Job 23:10-12). These asseverations of innocence (e.g., in Ps. 15; 17; 24; 26) point unequivocally to the uninterrupted relationship with God; similar texts emphasize that the righteous do not possess righteousness before God solely from within themselves (Job 9:2ff.; Ps. 143:1-2). Hence such divine testing can even be desired so that the relationship between the righteous and their God can be even more firmly secured (Ps. 139:23-24).

The social character of righteousness means that each time the individual passes such divine tests, the community itself is also blessed. This idea is taken a step further in the case of the "suffering righteous"; not only does the suffering of such persons enable them to help others to righteousness, they also take the suffering of others onto themselves. Every instance of such election includes both the element of representative suffering and the possibility that the suffering of the "suffering righteous" can also bring about reconciliation (Ps. 22; Isa. 53).

VI. LXX. The LXX consistently renders derivatives of the stem *ṣdq* with *dikaioún, dikaiosýnē,* and *díkaios.* Furthermore, in about 25 passages it translates *ḥeseḏ, ʾemeṯ, mišpāṭ,* and related terms as *dikaiosýnē.* On the other hand, in about 50 (of roughly 270) passages, the Greek translators render Heb. *ṣeḏeq/ṣᵉḏāqâ* with other Greek terms.[101]

---

99. → בחן *bḥn,* II, 69ff.; → חקר *ḥāqar,* V, 148ff.; → נסה *nissâ,* IX, 443ff.

100. B. Gerhardsson, *The Testing of God's Son. CBNT* 2/1 (1966), 25-35; L. Ruppert, *Der leidende Gerechte. FzB* 5 (1972).

101. Many studies have addressed the question of the LXX translation of *ṣdq:* C. H. Dodd, *The Bible and the Greeks* (London, 1935); A. Descamps, "La justice de Dieu dans la Bible grecque," *Studia Hellenistica* 5 (1948) 69-92; N. M. Watson, "Some Observations on the Use of ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣ in the Septuagint," *JBL* 79 (1960) 255-66; O. Kaiser, "Dike und Sedaqa," *Neue*

The Heb. *ṣeḏeq* and *ṣᵉḏāqâ* differ from Gk. *dikaiosýnē* especially in that *ṣdq* as a relational term describes the relationship between two parties whereas *dikaiosýnē* as one of the four cardinal virtues describes a human habitus. Thus does the translator of, e.g., Ps. 24:4-5, find it difficult to render *ṣᵉḏāqâ* as *dikaiosýnē* because the focus is on blessing and righteousness that the innocent person will actually receive from God. Hence the translator chooses *eleēmosýnē*, "compassion," instead. Similar examples are found in Ps. 103:6; Isa. 1:27; 56:1; 59:16; and elsewhere. In some of these passages, the understanding of *ṣᵉḏāqâ* as "alms" may have exerted some influence. Cf. the later semantic development[102] and Aram. *ṣiḏqâ* (Dnl. 4:24[27]) as well as, in a similar connection, Mt. 6:1-2.[103] Other translations include *katharós, kríma, krísis, alēthḗs, pistós,* and *euphrosýnē* (robe of "cheerfulness," Isa. 61:10). The verb can also be rendered with *díkaios* + *anaphaínein* or *apophaínein*.

Although the Greek translator generally did not hesitate to translate Hebrew terms literally, the problem was that *dikaiosýnē* as an expression of salvific and beneficent righteousness was alien to Greek usage in the first place. One can certainly be endowed with *dikaiosýnē* or be *díkaios*, but cannot really receive it. This difficulty in fully understanding Heb. *ṣdq*, a difficulty already present in the LXX, continues even into the present.[104]

VII. Qumran. The root *ṣdq* occurs frequently in the Qumran writings (about 140 occurrences).[105] Drawing on the work of Koch and others, Boecker has found that in the Qumran texts, as in the OT, *ṣdq* refers to beneficent but never chastising righteousness. The salvific *ṣᵉḏāqâ* is a gift of God. There is an important distinction, however, in that the freedom of the will emphasized so strongly, e.g., by the Pharisees, recedes, and in its place the idea of predestination is underscored, an idea that could also pick up on the notion of the "remnant." The elect group now represented the true Israel.

1QM 17:8 seems to hypostatize righteousness: "*ṣeḏeq* shall rejoice on high."[106]

Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie und Religionsphilosophie 7 (1965) 251-73; D. Hill, *Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings. SNTSMS* 5 (1967), esp. 82-162; M. J. Fiedler, "Δικαιοσύνη in der diaspora-jüdischen und intertestamentarischen Literatur," *JSJ* 1 (1970), 120-43; J. W. Olley, *"Righteousness" in the Septuagint of Isaiah. SBLSCS* 8 (1979); T. Muraoka, "On Septuagint Lexicography and Patristics," *JTS* 35 (1984) 441-48.

102. B. Janowski, *Sühne als Heilsgeschehen. WMANT* 55 (1982), 139-40.

103. W. Nagel, "Gerechtigkeit — oder Almosen?" *Vigiliae Christianae* 15 (1961) 141-45.

104. In this regard see F. Stolz, review of H. Bianchi, "Das Tsedeka-Modell als Alternative zum konventionellen Strafrecht," *Zeitschrift für Evangelische Ethik* 18 (1974) 246-47, with bibliog.

105. The basic studies are P. Wernberg-Møller, "צדק, צדיק, and צדוק in the Zakodite Fragments (CDC), the Manual of Discipline (DSD), and the Habakkuk Commentary (DSH)," *VT* 3 (1953) 310-15; J. Becker *Das Heil Gottes. Heils- und Sündenbegriffe in den Qumrantexten und im NT. SUNT* 3 (1964); S. Schulz, "Zur Rechtfertigung aus Gnaden in Qumran und bei Paulus," *ZTK* 56 (1959) 155-85; W. Grundmann, "Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit von Qumran," *RevQ* 2 (1960) 237-59; cf. also J. K. West, "Justification in the Qumran Scrolls" (diss., Vanderbilt, 1961); and Sanders, 305ff.

106. G. Pfeifer, *Ursprung und Wesen der Hypostasenvorstellung im Judentum. AzT* I/31 (1967), 36.

H. Ringgren, however, suggests the alternate translation, "he shall rejoice in righteousness."[107]

The *môreh haṣṣeḏeq* poses a special problem.[108] Was this "teacher of righteousness" a particularly important leader in the history of the Qumran community, or even John the Baptist?[109] Although some connection with John may exist,[110] caution is advised,[111] and at least the identity should for the moment be left open.[112]

B. Johnson

---

107. *Handskrifterna fran Qumran, IV-V. SEÅ Sup* 15 (1956), 36.

108. → ירה *yārâ* (II), VI, 338.

109. P. Wallendorff, מורה הצדק *Rättfärdigkhetens lärare* (Helsinki, 1964); B. Thiering, *Redating the Teacher of Righteousness. Australian and New Zealand Studies in Theology and Religion* 1 (Sydney, 1979).

110. Concerning the question of a possible connection, see also R. Eisenmann, *Maccabees, Zadokites, Christians and Qumran. StPB* 34 (1983), 36-37.

111. See H. Burgmann, review of E. Thiering, *Redating the Teacher of Righteousness, RevQ* 10 (1980) 314-17.

112. See B. Otzen, *Den antike jødedom* (Copenhagen, 1984), 124-25, following Ringgren and Vermes.

צָהֳרַיִם *ṣoh°rayim*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology; 2. LXX. II. OT Use: 1. Time; 2. Midday Demon; 3. Theological Context.

I. 1. *Etymology.* Two divergent views have been advanced regarding the etymology of *ṣoh°rayim.* Reference is occasionally made to Akk. *ṣēru,* "back,"[1] and Heb. *ṣōhar* "back; roof" (Gen. 6:16, hapax legomenon), hence *ṣoh°rayim* comes to refer to the point of solar culmination.[2] A less persuasive suggestion adduces the Ugar. root *ṭhr/*

ṣoh°rayim. G. Dalman, *AuS,* I/2, 610-13; E. Mahler, "Die chronologische Bedeutung von ערבים und צהרים," *ZDMG* 68 (1914) 677-86; J. de Fraine, "Le 'démon du midi' (Ps. 91[90],6)," *Bibl* 40 (1959) 372-83.

1. *AHw,* III, 1093-95; *CAD,* XVI, 138-47.

2. J. E. Armstrong, "A Critical Note on Genesis VI 16aα," *VT* 10 (1960) 328; E. Jenni, "יוֹם *yôm* day," *TLOT,* II, 527-28; *HAL,* III, 1008b.

ẓhr, "shine, radiate."[3] Extrabiblical occurrences of this root in the meaning "midday, noon" include Moab. *ṣhr* on the Mesha stela,[4] Syr. *ṭahrā,*[5] Can. *ṣhr,*[6] Old South Arabic DN *ḏāt ẓahrān* (cf., however, *ẓhr,* "back"[7]), and Arab. *ḍazhr,* "back," *ẓuhr,* "midday."[8]

The Heb. *ṣoh°rayim* represents neither a plural nor a dual form. A more likely explanation involves the adverbial ending *-ām* of the sort added to *yôm* in the form *yômām* and also attested in connection with Moab. *ṣhr.*[9]

2. *LXX.* The LXX translates *ṣoh°rayim* as *mesēmbría;* only in 1 K. 18:29 does it use *deilinón.*

II. OT Use. Along with → בקר *bōqer* and → ערב *'ereḇ,* terms used to divide the day[10] into its main divisions also include *ṣoh°rayim* (cf. Ps. 55:18a[Eng. 17a]), with the latter referring to the highest point of the sun, i.e., to noon. The term occurs 23 times in the OT without any specific discernible distributional patterns among the various literary strata.

1. *Time.* As a temporal indicator, *ṣoh°rayim* represents first of all the time of day, e.g., with regard to the noon meal (Gen. 43:16,25) and the midday nap (2 S. 4:5) or pause (Cant. 1:7). The mention of evening, morning, and noon as times of prayer in Ps. 55:18(17) does not allow one to deduce straightaway the presence of institutionalized midday prayer, since the meristic style employed here refers to the day in its entirety.[11] Similar examples of merism designating the morning include the formulation *babbōqer . . . b°'ēṯ ṣoh°rayim* in Jer. 20:16 and the description of the invocation of Ba'al by his prophets from morning till noon (1 K. 18:26) and their ecstasy from noon to the time of the offering (18:29).

Midday is unfavorable for military operations because of the sun's high position in the sky, making it all the more surprising when the enemy does indeed attack at this time (1 K. 20:16; Jer. 6:4). In military contexts *baṣṣoh°rayim* can also connote "already by noon." Hence according to Zeph. 2:4, Ashdod is taken captive before even noon after a battle lasting merely half a day. Comparable texts include a remark from the Mesha stela according to which Mesha takes Nebo after a battle lasting merely from morning till midday.[12]

---

3. *WUS,* no. 1115; J. A. Emerton, "The Meaning of *'abnê qōdeš* in Lamentations 4:1," *ZAW* 79 (1967) 236; J. H. Eaton, "Some Questions of Philology and Exegesis in the Psalms," *JTS* 19 (1968) 605.

4. *KAI* 181.15; *DNSI,* II, 964.

5. *LexSyr,* 269.

6. EA 232:11.

7. Biella, 230-31.

8. Lane, I/5, 1929.

9. *KAI* 181.15; JM, §91g.

10. → יום *yôm,* VI, 7-32.

11. Contra J. Krašovec, *Der Merismus im Biblisch-Hebräischen und Nordwestsemitischen. BietOr* 33 (1977), 132.

12. *KAI* 181.15-16; cf. W. Rudolph, *Micha — Nahum — Habakuk — Zephanja. KAT* XIII/3 (1975), 280 n. 2.

2. *Midday Demon.* Several passages still contain ancient references to a demon that appeared at midday. Ps. 91:6 speaks of the pestilence that "wastes at noonday,"[13] while according to Jer. 15:8 it is Yahweh himself who brings the destroyer *(šōḏēḏ)* against the women of Jerusalem and strikes them with anguish and terror. Although the same notion may also have influenced Zeph. 2:4 such that the reference is actually to a pestilence *(šēḏ)* that drives the inhabitants from the city at midday,[14] the background provided by the Mesha stela suggests that the meaning of *ṣohᵒrayim* in this passage too is purely temporal. It is equally questionable whether the idea of the midday demon has influenced 2 K. 4:18-20, since the Shunammite's child complains of headaches and dies at noon.[15] The background for this understanding of noon as the time of crisis includes the Egyptian notion of the sun barque whose pause at midday is viewed as the culmination of the crisis, a crisis that can bring famine, pestilence, or war.[16]

3. *Theological Context.* References to God's actions at midday are equivocal because God can bring both disaster and salvation upon people. References to disaster in this context are probably to be understood in continuity with the assumption of evil demons who appear at noon. In this sense Yahweh will cause the disobedient to "grope about at noon as blind people grope in the darkness" (Dt. 28:29), though in another context even the wise are said to "grope at noonday as in the night" (Job 5:14; *māšaš* piel in both passages). Sinners bring the same fate upon themselves; they stumble[17] like the dead at noon "as in the twilight" (Isa. 59:10). All three passages juxtapose *ṣohᵒrayim* metaphorically with deficient human understanding.

Part of God's judgment on human beings will be to make the sun go down at noon (Am. 8:9), an action whose antithesis occurs when the sun stands still at its culmination point in heaven (Josh. 10:13) indicating victory for Israel and defeat for its enemies.[18]

By contrast, *ṣohᵒrayim* can also be understood positively in reference to appropriate human behavior. Trito-Isaiah promises to those who end oppression, derision, and need that their own gloom will be brightened like the noonday (Isa. 58:9-10). Yahweh similarly causes the righteousness of the good to shine like the light and their justice like the noonday (Ps. 37:6), recalling the promise that the lives of the just will be "brighter than the noonday" (Job 11:17).

Niehr

---

13. See H. Gunkel, *Die Psalmen. HKAT* II/2 (⁵1968), 404; de Fraine.

14. See K. Seybold, *Satirische Prophetie: Studien zum Buch Zefanja. SBS* 120 (1985), 45.

15. In this regard see P. Hugger, *Jahwe meine Zuflucht. MüSt* 13 (1971), 197 n. 135.

16. See J. Assmann, *Re und Amun: Die Krise des polytheistischen Weltbilds im Ägypten der 18.-20. Dynastie. OBO* 51 (1983), 78.

17. → כשׁל *kšl,* VII, 353ff.

18. See in this regard H.-P. Stähli, *Solare Elemente im Jahweglauben des ATs. OBO* 66 (1985), 35-36.

צַוָּאר ṣawwā'r

Contents: I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences; 3. LXX. II. Use: 1. Neck of Animals; 2. Greeting; 3. Pride; 4. Bearing the Yoke (Judgment)

I. 1. *Etymology.* No clear evidence relating to the etymology of *ṣawwā'r* has emerged, though some scholars suspect a common Semitic base form (**ṣawar/ṣaur* or *ṣaw'ar*).[1] Corresponding forms are found in Old Akkadian, Syriac, Jewish Aramaic, Christian Palestinian Aramaic, Samaritan, Mandaic, and Ethiopic with the meaning "load bearer," and in Arabic as *ṣaur,* "shore, bank." This Arabic understanding seems to resonate in the Assyrian equivalent *kišādu,* which can mean both "neck, nape," and "shore, bank."[2]

2. *Occurrences.* The noun *ṣawwā'r,* meaning "neck/nape," occurs 27 times in the OT in the singular (Gen. 27:40; 41:42; Dt. 28:48; Neh. 3:5; Job 15:26; 39:19; 41:14[Eng. 22]; Ps. 75:6[5]; Cant. 1:10; 4:4; 7:5[4]; Isa. 8:8; 10:27; 30:28; 52:2; Jer. 27:2,8,11; 28:10,11,12,14; 30:8; Lam. 1:14; 5:5; Hos. 10:11; Hab. 3:13) and 13 times in the plural (Gen. 27:16; 33:4; 45:14[bis]; 46:29 [in 33:4, *Q* is to be read in accommodation to 45:14; 46:29]; Josh. 10:24[bis]; Jgs. 5:30; 8:21,26; Jer. 27:12; Ezk. 21:34[29]; Mic. 2:3, with an exceptional pl. form in *-ôṯ*). In Qumran the form appears only in CD 1:19. Sirach mentions *ṣawwā'r* only in 51:26.[3]

3. *LXX.* The LXX consistently translates *ṣawwā'r* as *tráchēlos,* in isolated instances with *pháranx* (Isa. 30:28) or *ṓmos* (Isa. 10:27). It translates *b^eṣawwā'r* in Job 15:26 contextually as *hýbrei.* (Concerning Ps. 75:6 see below.)

II. Use.

1. *Neck of Animals.* Several passages, such as Job 39:19 and Jgs. 8:21,26, adduce the beauty of an animal's neck, the former in reference to the natural, God-given adornment of the horse's mane, the latter to the necks of the Midianite camels decorated with amulets. Job 41:14 thinks of the crocodile's neck less as such than as a symbol for the animal's strength, albeit here more its physical than psychological strength.

ṣawwā'r. W. Bunte, "Hals," *BHHW,* II, 628; P. Dhorme, *L'emploi métaphorique des noms des parties du corps en hébreu et en accadien* (1923; repr. Paris, 1963); H. Holma, *Die Namen der Körperteile im Assyrisch-Babylonischen. AnAcScFen* B VII/1 (1911); O. Keel, *Deine Blicke sind Tauben: Zur Metaphorik des Hohen Liedes. SBS* 114/115 (1984); J. Oelsner, "Benennung und Funktion der Körperteile im hebräischen AT" (diss., Leipzig, 1960); T. Schlatter, "Hals," *Calwer Bibellexikon* (Stuttgart, 1959), 458.

1. *HAL,* III, 1009.
2. Holma, 39; on the use of *kišādu* (*AHw,* I, 490) in similar contexts as *ṣawwā'r* in the OT, see Dhorme, 91. On its meaning, → עֹרֶף *'ōrep.*
3. See II.4 below (Qumran and Sirach).

2. *Greeting.* The term *ṣawwā'r* is used in connection with a particularly intimate greeting in Gen. 33:4; 45:14; 46:29 (cf. also Lk. 15:20). The background of such "falling upon a person's neck" as a sign of emphatic greeting is at times a separation prompted by culpable behavior, so that Westermann's remark on Gen. 33:4 applies to the other passages as well: "the warm welcome includes the forgiveness."[4]

3. *Pride.* A larger group of texts speak of the "neck" in the figurative sense in connection with pride or dignity in both a positive and negative sense. Pharaoh bestows special honor on Joseph by placing a gold chain around his neck (Gen. 41:42). Cant. 1:10 extols the beautiful neck of the beloved, and 4:4 and 7:5 compare it to a tower, a comparison probably less focused on the form of the neck than on the woman's dignity, pride, and self-assurance. One cannot determine whether the comparison also draws attention to the woman's inviolability or to the preservation of her virginity, and such reference seems questionable in any event.[5] In Jgs. 5:30 the adornment of the victor's neck with dyed cloths taken as spoil alludes to the pride of the victor.

Josh. 10:24 issues the negatively charged order for the victors to put their feet on the necks of the vanquished to demonstrate the complete subjugation of the latter as well as the complete loss of their dignity. Job 15:26 criticizes those who resist God by running against him with their "necks." Neh. 3:5 similarly criticizes the nobles who were too haughty to bend their necks and help out with work on the wall. Here the term *'ᵃḏōnêhem* is not intended as a divine designation; unlike Job 15:26, this passage criticizes prideful behavior toward other people rather than toward God.

Text-critical issues remain regarding whether Ps. 75:6a(5a) criticizes prideful behavior when it rebukes those who speak "with insolent neck." Some scholars follow the LXX in reading *ṣûr* instead of *ṣawwā'r* in analogy to Hab. 3:13, where the context seems to require such emendation. The par. *mārôm* in Ps. 75:6a(5a) suggests following the LXX, whereas *tārîmû* could certainly also find its own continuation in *ṣawwā'r.* In that case this passage would be the only one using *ṣawwā'r* in reference to a particular manner of speaking (toward God), making the LXX reading preferable.[6]

4. *Bearing the Yoke (Judgment).* The yoke Yahweh puts on his people's neck or back is mentioned in Dt. 28:48: Jer. 27:2,8,11,12; 28:10,11,12,14 (cf. Acts 15:10), the references in Jer. 27:2; 28:10,12 being to the concrete, visible yoke associated with the symbolic act.[7] As part of such a symbolic act, however, it already refers back to the yoke of Yahweh's chastising acts. The task of the people is then to bear this yoke and even to offer up its neck to it (Jer. 27:8,11), accepting thus Babylonian rule in obedience to Yahweh. The image of the iron yoke evokes the particularly humiliating bondage (Dt.

---

4. C. Westermann, *Genesis 12–36* (Eng. trans. 1985), 525.
5. In this regard see Keel, 32-39; also O. Keel, *Song of Songs* (Eng. trans. 1994), 147, 236.
6. See H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150* (Eng. trans. 1989), 103; F. Baethgen, *Die Psalmen. HKAT* II/2 (1897), 232, with reference to the interpretation of Aquila, Quinta and Jerome, Syr., Tg., which preserve the MT, and to Symmachus.
7. → מוט *mwṭ,* VIII, 152ff.; → על *'ōl.*

28:48; Jer. 28:14) Yahweh imposes, bondage that cannot be broken and that Jer. 28 consciously juxtaposes with Hananiah's promise that the Babylonian yoke would be broken and removed from the necks of all the nations. In Hos. 10:11 both the context and the surrounding references to the yoke suggest that the yoke Yahweh will now place on Ephraim's neck refers more to an intensification of Ephraim's plight than to any greater plans Yahweh may have had with Ephraim.[8] The breaking of the yoke from someone's neck is the focus in Gen. 27:40; Isa. 10:27; 52:2*(Q);* Jer. 30:8; in Isa. 10:27; 52:2; Jer. 30:8, Yahweh himself breaks the yoke in bringing liberation from Assyrian (Isa. 10:27) or Babylonian (Isa. 52:2; Jer. 30:8) domination. By contrast, Gen. 27:40 speaks of Esau's liberation from the yoke of his brother.

Lam. 1:14 and 5:5 speak about what seems to be a different kind of yoke on one's neck, the first imposed by one's own sin (1:14), the other by the sins of one's ancestors (5:5). Lam. 5:5 probably also refers to foreign domination as the result of sin. By contrast, Sir. 51:26 refers to the positive rather than humiliating aspects of bending one's neck under the yoke of wisdom. The term *ṣawwā'r* also appears in the remaining texts in connection with statements of judgment. Isa. 8:8 and 30:28 speak about the water that will reach to one's neck, with 8:8 referring probably to the Assyrians who are oppressing Judah (rather than to any concrete flood, and certainly not of the river Euphrates[9]), and 30:28 emphasizing Yahweh's wrath in an oracle of judgment against Assyria. Ezk. 21:34(29) probably also refers to the threat of foreign domination; in this vision the Ammonites place their swords over the necks of (probably) the Judeans. Mic. 2:3 also recalls the notion of yoke when it proclaims the people will not be able to remove their necks from the coming disaster. The only occurrence in Qumran (CD 1:19) enumerates a series of reproaches, including the choosing of "fair necks," possibly an allusion to the rejection of Yahweh's yoke.[10]

Gen. 27:16 uses *ṣawwā'r* simply in reference to part of the body, namely, to the smooth part of Jacob's neck.

Hausmann

---

8. F. Marti, *Das Dodekapropheton. KHC* XIII (1904), 83; J. Jeremias, *Der Prophet Hosea. ATD* XXIV/1 (1983), 134.

9. So B. Duhm, *Das Buch Jesaja. HKAT* III/1 (^{2}1902), 56.

10. See J. Maier, *Die Texte vom Toten Meer,* 2 vols. (1960), II, 43. Concerning references to *ṣawwā'r* in the Aramaic texts, see Beyer, 675.

צוד *ṣwd;* צַיִד *ṣayiḏ*

Contents: I. Etymology and Occurrences. II. Hunting in the Ancient Near East. III. Hunting in the OT: 1. Basic Considerations; 2. Procurement of Food; 3. Metaphors; 4. Yahweh's Response to Job. IV. LXX. V. Qumran.

I. Etymology and Occurrences. The term *ṣwd* is a common Semitic root meaning "hunt, fish." In Akkadian, *ṣâdu(m)* has the additional connotation of "turn [said of people and storms], swirl, become dizzy," and "hunt about, roam about restlessly."[1] The lexeme is also attested in Ugaritic,[2] Phoenician[3] (including the place-name *ṣaida* [Sidon], generally derived from *ṣud,* "fish," whence "City of Fishers"[4]), and Aramaic.[5] The Arabic term *ṣāda/ṣaid* similarly means "hunt" and "fish"; *miṣyada* means "a trap, snare, net."[6] The Syr. *ṣwd* has the same meaning.[7]

The verb *ṣûḏ* occurs 14 times, including 11 in the qal and 3 in the polel. Derivatives include five nouns: *ṣayiḏ,* "hunting, prey, game" (Gen. 10:9; 25:27,28; 27:3,5,7,19,25, 30,31,33; Lev. 17:13; Prov. 12:27; Jer. 30:17 cj.), *ṣayyāḏ,* "hunter" (Jer. 16:16; Eccl. 6:5 cj.), *māṣôḏ,* "prey, net, siege tower" (Eccl. 9:14; Job 19:6 [uncertain]; Ps. 116:3 cj.;[8]

ṣwd. H. Altenmüller, "Jäger, Jagd, Jagddarstellungen, Jagdmethoden, Jagdritual, Jagdtracht, Jagdzauber," *LexÄg,* III, 219-36; idem, *Darstellungen der Jagd im Alten Ägypten* (Hamburg/ Berlin, 1967); P. Amiet, "Quelques ancêtres du chasseur royal d'Ugarit," *Ugaritica* VI (1969) 1-8; R. Bartelmus, "Die Tierwelt in der Bibel: Exegetische Beobachtungen zu einem Teilaspekt der Diskussion um eine Theologie der Nature," *BN* 37 (1987) 11-37; G. Dalman, *AuS,* VI, 314ff.; W. Fauth, "Der königliche Gärtner und Jäger im Paradeisos: Beobachtungen zur Rolle des Herrschers in der vorderasiatischen Hortikultur," *Persica* 8 (1979) 1-53; K. Galling, "Jagd," *BRL*², 150-52; G. Gerleman, "Contributions to the OT Terminology of the Chase," *Bull. de la Soc. des Lettres de Lund 1945-46* IV (Lund, 1946) 79-90; W. Heimpel and L. Trümpelmann, "Jagd," *RLA,* V, 234-38; W. Helck, *Jagd und Wild im alten Vorderasien: Die Jagd in der Kunst* (Hamburg, 1968); M.-L. Henry, *Das Tier im religiösen Bewusstsein des alttestamentlichen Menschen* (Tübingen, 1958); O. Keel, *Jahwes Entgegnung an Ijob. FRLANT* 121 (1978), esp. 63-125; idem, M. Küchler, and C. Uehlinger, *Orte und Landschaften der Bibel: Ein Handbuch und Studienreiseführer zum Heiligen Land,* I, *Geographisch-geschichtliche Landeskunde* (Zurich, 1984), 100-181; M. Landmann, *Das Tier in der jüdischen Weisung* (Heidelberg, 1959); B. Meissner, *Assyrische Jagden. AO* 13/2 (1911); A. Salonen, *Jagd und Jagdtiere im Alten Mesopotamien* (Helsinki, 1976).

1. See *AHw,* III, 1073-74.
2. See *WUS,* no. 2302; *UT,* nos. 1718, 2151.
3. See *KAI* 69.12; 74.9.
4. See C. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11* (Eng. trans. 1984), 521; a different view is taken by E. Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums,* I/II (Stuttgart/Berlin, 1913; repr. Darmstadt, 1981), §356, who derives it instead from the god *ṣd.*
5. *KAI* 261.5.
6. See Wehr, 532.
7. See *CSD,* 474-75.
8. See H. Hupfeld and W. Nowak, *Die Psalmen,* II (Gotha, ³1888), 517.

Prov. 12:12; Eccl. 7:26); *m*ᵉ*ṣûḏâ*, "game; hunting net" (Ezk. 12:13; 13:21; 17:20 and Ezk. 19:8 cj.; concerning the meaning "mountain stronghold," see below), and *m*ᵉ*ṣôḏâ*, "net, mountain stronghold" (Isa. 29:7; Ezk. 19:9 uncertain; Eccl. 9:12).

Two etymological questions remain. The first involves the relationship between *ṣûḏ* and *ṣyd*, "take provisions for a journey" (Josh. 9:12), or the derivative nouns *ṣayiḏ* II, "provisions, food for a journey" (Josh. 9:5,14; Neh. 13:15; Job 38:41; Ps. 132:15), and *ṣêḏâ*, which occurs 10 times (Gen. 27:3 *K*; 42:25; 45:21; Ex. 12:39; Josh. 1:11; 9:11; Jgs. 7:8; 20:10; 1 S. 22:10; Ps. 78:25). Do these terms genuinely involve two different roots, or is the distinction between the two roots *ṣwd* and *ṣyd* only secondary, as suggested by the numerous formal and substantive similarities?[9] The basic meaning from which the two developed might then have been "procure nourishment."

The second question involves the rather obscure derivation of the specialized meaning of *m*ᵉ*ṣûḏâ*, which besides "prey, catch" (Ezk. 13:21), and "net" (Ps. 66:11; Ezk. 12:13; 17:20) generally means "mountain fortress," and *m*ᵉ*ṣāḏ*, which together occur 38 times with this meaning.[10] How does one explain this semantic shift from "prey, catch, net" to "mountain fortress"? Did *m*ᵉ*ṣûḏâ/m*ᵉ*ṣāḏ* refer originally to a "hunting lodge," whence then the more generalized meaning arose as a synecdoche?[11] Or was it a "raised platform" used by hunters that then came to refer metaphorically to a "mountain fortress"?[12] Although the latter suggestion seems most plausible, archaeological and iconographic evidence for such hunting platforms is lacking. One possibility is to distinguish between *m*ᵉ*ṣûḏâ* I and II[13] and to derive the meaning "mountain stronghold" from the root *mṣd*, "suck" (cf. Arab. *maṣada*, "breast"), though even this suggestion is not entirely persuasive.

II. Hunting in the Ancient Near East. Hunting played a significant role in Israel's environs. Although it was a primary means of procuring nourishment at the more primitive stages of culture, as the high cultures increasingly used domesticated animals to provide meat it receded in importance and became an insignificant part of economic life dedicated primarily to protecting flocks from predators. Yet despite this economic insignificance, the actual social status of the hunter was considerable. He enjoyed high esteem because of his strength, quickness, courage, and endurance, and could even assume heroic or semidivine stature in stories. Even private citizens who were not hunters by profession boasted of their hunting successes in their tomb inscriptions. Overall, a great deal of such hunting was a genteel sport rather than a means of procuring food; it was conducted with great fanfare, equipment, and retainers and was the privilege of the upper classes, especially of the king. Assyrian and Persian rulers even maintained animal parks in which they regularly held such hunts. The primary animals hunted were lions, wild bulls, wild goats, ostriches, bears, and birds. Hunting weapons in-

---

9. See *GK*, §73.1,2.
10. → מצודה *m*ᵉ*ṣûḏâ*, VIII, 501ff.
11. So König, 240.
12. Suggested by *KBL*², 555.
13. So *HAL*, II, 622.

cluded bows, arrows, spears, and daggers, and occasionally one's bare hands, though also nets and pits. Powerful hunting dogs were almost always present. The king generally hunted from a chariot, though occasionally also on foot. All these details are well documented by the numerous hunting portrayals that have been preserved.[14]

Yet an interpretation of hunting as merely a way to procure meat or as a luxury sport, even with the secondary aspect of military training, misses the mark. Because hunting involves killing, it also intrudes into the divine sphere and thus acquires a religious dimension. Appropriate hunting practices thus require ritual preparations and cultic support often including magic, and necessarily conclude with a sacrifice to the gods in whose sphere the hunter has intruded and whose rights he has usurped. This background might also explain the tendency to elevate the symbolic status of hunting. Most hunting portrayals are in fact not realistic portrayals at all, but rather political-programmatic metaphors, and the wild animals themselves become the symbols of evil powers to be thwarted.[15] The king now appears as the "lord of the animals"[16] with the task of thwarting the evil and chaos concentrated in the animals and threatening the cosmic order. An intimate relationship between hunting and war emerges[17] in that in both instances the king has to demonstrate his power and guarantee the continued existence of the world. This background accounts for the importance attaching to success in hunting, a specific topos within royal self-praise, and a hunting portrayal is thus to be understood as a "magical picture" with apotropaic powers through which the king acquires the power to battle evil.[18] The typology of the hunt constitutes the manifestation or even culmination of the ancient Near Eastern royal ideology, the understanding of the king who in his battle with the mightiest animals openly demonstrates his power, superiority, success, and strength.[19] This notion resonates in the OT in those portrayals of the accession of foreign rulers that strikingly include the animal world as well (Jer. 27:5-6; 28:14).

III. Hunting in the OT.

1. *Basic Considerations.* In general, the OT contains surprisingly few references to hunting. Considering the plethora of game in Palestine and the ubiquitous presence of game on the royal table as well (1 K. 5:3[4:23]), remarkably little is said about the actual work of the hunter. This sparse evidence is equally peculiar given the plethora of evidence in the surrounding cultures. Not a single Israelite king engages in the otherwise common royal self-exaltation with regard to great hunting prowess, not even Solomon, and none conducts royal hunts. Neither Samson nor David constitutes an exception, since although both are said to have killed a lion or bear with their bare hands (Jgs. 14:5-6; 1 S. 17:34-37), they did so out of self-defense. Even Samson's use of the

---

14. See the catalog of archaeological material in *RLA,* V, 237-38.
15. Helck, 11.
16. See Keel, *Jahwes Entgegnung,* 86ff.
17. Helck, 12.
18. Ibid.
19. Helck, 17; cf. Fauth.

three hundred captured foxes (Jgs. 15:4-5) to burn the Philistines' fields ends up having an ambivalent effect (cf. 15:6ff.). Self-exaltation through hunting success was one element of royal ideology that remained alien to Israel. To the contrary, the great hunters (and hunting gods?) seem to have been viewed quite critically in Israel. Even Nimrod, the mighty founder of Babylon and Assyria behind whom tradition history might possibly find the hunting deity Nin-ib[20] or Ninurta,[21] is degraded to the status of a "mighty hunter *before* Yahweh" (Gen. 10:9).[22] In any event Nimrod comes to personify evil especially in later tradition.[23] As a representative of the hunting class compared to upwardly mobile farmers, Esau comes across more as a coarse, simple-minded fellow who can be easily deceived.[24] Nowhere does the OT glorify hunting,[25] and this fact alone is theologically significant. Does the Priestly creation theology perhaps harbor a hidden reason for this skeptical view of hunting? "For God's full approval is only given to the world in which there is still no pouring of blood (Gen. 1:29ff.). When violence comes upon earth, God takes the opposite view (6:12f.)."[26] This disinclination toward violence is also reflected in eschatological expectation, especially in the expectation of peace among animals (Isa. 11:6-8; 65:17-25).

2. *Procurement of Food.* Even though hunting as such was not ideologically extolled, it was nonetheless certainly practiced, something shown especially by the ample imagery from the world of hunting in the Psalms and in wisdom literature, which frequently mention nets, pits, snares, and traps.[27] Game was considered a delicacy. As an old man, Isaac wants roasted game (Gen. 27:3-4, a passage with a high concentration of occurrences of *ṣûḏ*). Sumptuous portions of such game were offered at the royal table (1 K. 5:3[4:23]), and game was sold (cf. Neh. 13:15, albeit a passage with text-critical problems) and consumed everywhere (cf. Dt. 12:15). Like the meat of domestic animals, so also did game have to be completely drained of blood before being pure enough for consumption. Consumption of naturally deceased game or of game felled by other animals defiles a person for a day (Lev. 17:13-16). The designation of Nimrod as a "mighty hunter" is probably part of the demythologization accompanying such polemic.

3. *Metaphors.* Because the hunter chases something that is not easily caught, his success depends on hunting cleverly and skillfully. Hence the wise admonish, "the lazy [*r^e^mîyâ,* as opposed to the industrious] do not get their game" (Prov. 12:27).[28]

---

20. See H. Gunkel, *Genesis* (Eng. trans. 1997), 91.
21. See H. Ringgren, *Religions of the Ancient Near East* (Eng. trans. 1973), 62.
22. Concerning the usual understanding of the disputed expression *lipnê yhwh,* see Westermann, *Genesis 1–11,* 516-17.
23. See H. Schützinger, "Ursprung und Entwicklung der arabischen Abraham-Nimrod-Legende" (diss., Bonn, 1961).
24. See C. Westermann, *Genesis 12–36* (Eng. trans. 1985), 416-19, 431ff.
25. See in this regard J. Ortega y Gasset, *Toward a Philosophy of History* (Eng. trans. 1941).
26. W. H. Schmidt, *The Faith of the OT: A History* (Eng. trans. 1983), 174-75.
27. → רשת *rešeṯ;* → שחת *šaḥaṯ;* → פח *paḥ.*
28. See O. Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos (Proverbia). BK* XVII (1984), 153.

Among the numerous aspects of the hunt, however, metaphors emphasize not the experience of the hunter, but rather that of the hunted. Lam. 3:52 describes the situation of temptation and persecution: "Those who were my enemies without cause have hunted me like a bird" (cf. 4:18-19). Ps. 140:12(11) curses those who do violence and evil by wishing upon them the experience of the hunted: "Let evil speedily hunt down the violent!"

Life or the soul is often the hunted. Mic. 7:2 portrays the utter destruction of appropriate social relationships in Israel in the metaphor of those who hunt their own family members with nets like wild animals and who "lie in wait for blood." According to Ezk. 13:18, the false prophetesses pervert the rightful prophetic office of watching over souls and of turning them from evil; instead, these prophetesses hunt down the lives of the righteous with magical rites. The wisdom teacher advises to go to a prostitute rather than to another man's wife, since the former can be bought for a relatively small fee, while the latter is in fact hunting a man's very life (Prov. 6:26).

Things become especially terrifying and dangerous when it is Yahweh himself who is hunting down a person. In his absolute sovereignty, God ignores both guilt and innocence in hunting down "like a lion" those who dare rise up and dispute him (Job 10:16),[29] and Jeremiah similarly warns that judgment is inescapable; Yahweh will send experienced hunters to search out every hiding place and refuge (Jer. 16:16).

4. *Yahweh's Response to Job.* The understanding of the hunt has become especially important in interpreting Yahweh's response to Job (Job 38–41). O. Keel has tried to decipher this text, which has been much discussed and variously interpreted,[30] from the perspective of the hunting symbolism of the ancient Near East and has drawn several conclusions based on his assessment of numerous pictorial portrayals from Israel's surroundings.[31] First, the animals mentioned in Job 38–41 have not been chosen fortuitously or unsystematically, and represent rather the primary animals hunted during this period. Second, they are not to be understood as game or prey in the usual sense, but rather as symbols of chaos and of various threats to life. Third, in Yahweh's double response to Job's laments, Yahweh demonstrates (Job 38–39) his own identity as the "Lord of the animals" who controls the (animal) world despite its wildness and destructive forces. "Yahweh keeps control of chaos without turning it into boring, rigid order."[32] The double response also (Job 40–41) points out that there is an underived evil in the world represented by Leviathan and Behemoth and possessing a certain degree of independence over against Yahweh. Yahweh, however, in analogy to Horus, who slays the hippopotamus and the crocodile, repeatedly does battle with this element of evil and repeatedly wins that battle anew. This interpretation represents a step forward insofar as it draws from ancient Near Eastern iconography in persuasively demonstrating the symbolic value of these animals as well as both their origin and composition in connection with the royal hunt.

---

29. See III.4 below.

30. See the survey by J. van Oorschot, *Gott als Grenze: Eine literar- und redaktionsgeschichtliche Studie zu den Gottesreden des Hiobbuches. BZAW* 170 (1987).

31. See II above.

32. Keel, *Jahwes Entgegnung,* 125.

Its identification of Yahweh with the "Lord of animals" within that hunting topos, however, is problematical in that the word *ṣûḏ/ṣayiḏ* occurs but twice in the entire textual complex, and then only in connection with nourishment for animals: for the lion in 38:39 and for the raven in 38:41. Hence quite in contrast to hunting them with bow and arrow or with spear and nets, Yahweh intercedes for these animals and provides for their nourishment. In other words the response to Job's lament concerning the chaotic powers of the world is that it is Yahweh himself who takes care of those powers and sees to it that they fare well. This response turns the metaphor of the "Lord of the animals" upside down. Whence also the interpretation of Job 40–41 seems off the mark in its assertion that Behemoth represents an antidivine power. Quite the contrary, it too is God's creation, just as is Job himself (40:15,19). Human beings cannot vanquish Leviathan, this "king over all predators" (41:26[34]). Rather than implementing the previously discussed royal ideology, such a view implicitly mocks and even abrogates it (cf., e.g., 40:32[41:8]). Yahweh does not do battle with Leviathan as does the king or Horus. Leviathan is rather Yahweh's plaything (40:29[41:5]; cf. esp. Ps. 104:26); indeed, precisely in dealing playfully with the powers of chaos, Yahweh demonstrates his incomprehensible power, a power infinitely surpassing human possibilities. Any genuinely satisfactory interpretation of Yahweh's discourses at the conclusion to the book of Job must thus take into account that these discourses portray Yahweh not as the opponent and conqueror of animals in the sense familiar to ancient Near Eastern symbolism, but rather as the creator and maintainer of even these powers themselves, powers associated with the opposing world of chaos. This consideration clearly excludes any comfortable reliance on a dualism between God and antidivine or evil powers.

IV. LXX. The LXX uses 18 different terms to translate *ṣûḏ/ṣayiḏ*, the most important of which are *agreúein ktl., thēreúein ktl., kynēgeín ktl., borá, ochýrōma,* and *periochḗ*. Hardly any semantic shift is discernible among these words. Although the semantic field thus remains relatively stable, slight differences in accentuation do occur in two passages. In Ezk. 13:18,20, the translation with *dia/ekstréphein* shifts the notion of "hunting after a person's life" into "twisting a person's soul." Furthermore, translating *mᵉṣûḏâ* in the sense of "hunting fortress, mountain fortress,"[33] with *kataphygḗ* emphasizes the element of flight in the sense of "place of refuge, hiding place."

V. Qumran. In the Qumran texts the term *ṣwd* and its derivatives occur 7 times. 11QT 60:5,8 fix the amount of hunting booty to be rendered to the temple at a thousandth, and to the Levites at a hundredth. Elsewhere this word family refers to actions or tools of the wicked and of deceivers (CD 4:12; 16:15; 1QH 3:26; 4:12) or to these persons themselves (1QH 5:8). Hence the Qumran understanding of this root generally preserves the negative assessment of hunting.

Oeming

33. See I above.

צוה *ṣwh*

Contents: I. Extrabiblical Occurrences. II. Biblical Occurrences, Syntax, Stylistic Considerations, Semantic Field. III. Characteristic Expressions: 1. Priestly Writing; 2. Deuteronomy; 3. *ṣwh — dbr;* 4. *nāgîḏ — ṣwh;* 5. Installation Formulas. IV. Yahweh's Sovereign Power in Creation and History. V. 1. LXX; 2. Qumran.

ṣwh. W. A. M. Beuken, "Isa. 55:3-5: The Reinterpretation of David," *Bijdragen* 35 (1974) 49-64; E. Cortese, *La terra di Canaan nella storia sacerdotale del Pentateuco* (Brescia, 1972); idem, *Da Mosè a Esdra. I libri storici dell'Antico Israele* (Bologna, 1985);); S. J. de Vries, "The Development of the Deuteronomic Promulgation Formula," *Bibl* 55 (1974) 301-16; A. B. Ehrlich, *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel,* III (Leipzig, 1910); K. Elliger, "Sinn und Ursprung der priesterlichen Geschichtserzählung," *ZTK* 49 (1952) 121-43, repr. in *KlSchr,* 174-98; F. García López, "Analyse littéraire de Deutéronome, V–XI," *RB* 84 (1977) 481-522; 85 (1978) 5-49; idem, "Un profeta como Moisés: Estudio crítico de Dt 18,9-22," in N. Fernández Marcos, ed., *Simposio Biblico Español* (Madrid, 1984), 289-308; J. Halbe, *Das Privilegrecht Jahwes: Ex 34,10-26. FRLANT* 114 (1975); B. Halpern, *The Constitution of the Monarchy in Israel. HSM* 25 (1981); A. R. Hulst, "Opmerkingen over de *ka'ašer*-zinnen in Deuteronomium," *NedTT* 18 (1963-64) 337-61; L. Kopf, "Arabische Etymologien und Parallelen zum Bibelwörterbuch," *VT* 8 (1958) 161-215, esp. 197-98; C. J. Labuschagne, "The Pattern of the Divine Speech Formulas in the Pentateuch: The Key to Its Literary Structure," *VT* 32 (1982) 268-96; idem, "Divine Speech in Deuteronomy," in N. Lohfink, ed., *Das Deuteronomium: Entstehung, Gestalt, und Botschaft. BETL* 68 (1985), 111-26; F. Langlamet, "Israël et 'l'habitant du pays': Vocabulaire et formules d'Ex., XXXIV,11-16," *RB* 76 (1969) 321-50, 481-507; idem, *Gilgal et les récits de la traversée du Jourdain (Jos. III–IV). CahRB* 11 (1969); H. Leene, "Universalism or Nationalism? Isaiah XLV 9-13 and Its Context," *Bijdragen* 35 (1974) 309-34; G. Liedke, *Gestalt und Bezeichnung alttestamentlicher Rechtssätze: Eine formgeschichtlich-terminologische Studie. WMANT* 39 (1971); idem, "צוה *ṣwh* (pi.) to command," *TLOT,* II, 1062-65; N. Lohfink, *Das Hauptgebot: Eine Untersuchung literarischer Einleitungsfragen zu Dtn 5–11. AnBibl* 20 (1963); S. E. McEvenue, *The Narrative Style of the Priestly Writer. AnBibl* 50 (1971); T. N. D. Mettinger, *King and Messiah: The Civil and Sacral Legitimation of the Israelite Kings. CBOT* 8 (1976); W. L. Moran, "The Ancient Near Eastern Background of the Love of God in Deuteronomy," *CBQ* 25 (1963) 77-87; B. D. Naidoff, "The Two-fold Structure of Isaiah XLV 9-13," *VT* 31 (1981) 180-85; A. Pelletier, "L'autorité divine d'après le Pentateuque grec," *VT* 32 (1982) 236-42; J. R. Porter, "The Succession of Joshua," *Proclamation and Presence. FS G. H. Davies* (London, 1970), 102-32; R. Rendtorff, *Die Gesetze in der Priesterschrift: Eine gattungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung. FRLANT* 62 ([2]1963); W. Richter, "Die *nāgîd*-Formel: Ein Beitrag zur Erhellung des *nāgîd*-Problems," *BZ* 9 (1965) 71-84; E. Rubinstein, "The verb צוה — A Study in the Syntax of Biblical Hebrew," in A. Shinan, ed., *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies,* I (Jerusalem, 1977), 207-12; U. Rüterswörden, *Von der politischen Gemeinschaft zur Gemeinde: Studien zu Dt 16,18–18,22. BBB* 65 (1987), 86-87; K. Seybold, *Das davidische Königtum im Zeugnis der Propheten. FRLANT* 107 (1972); D. E. Skweres, *Die Rückverweise im Buch Deuteronomium. AnBibl* 79 (1979); R. Smend, "Das Gesetz und die Völker," *Probleme biblischer Theologie. FS G. von Rad* (Munich, 1971), 494-509; C. Stuhlmueller, *Creative Redemption in Deutero-Isaiah. AnBibl* 43 (1970); H. G. M. Williamson, "The Accession of Solomon in the Books of Chronicles," *VT* 26 (1976) 351-61; → מצוה *miṣwâ,* VIII, 505ff.

I. Extrabiblical Occurrences. The Heb. verb *ṣwh* has no direct parallels in other languages. Arad ostracon 18 (7th-6th century B.C.E.) does contain the verb in the formula *wldbr 'šr ṣwtny,* "concerning the matter you commanded me."[1] Similar formulas with *dbr* + *'šr* + *ṣwh* occur frequently in the MT (see Ex. 16:32; 35:4; Lev. 17:2; Josh. 8:35, etc.),[2] to announce an immediately following order or to refer to an order already given (so the Arad ostracon[3]).

Some authors adduce the relationship between the Heb. verb *ṣwh* and Imperial Aram. *ṣwt,* which appears in a letter to Jedoniah (4th century B.C.E.) in the expression *'mr tyry bw . . . bṣwt mlk',* "Tirib . . . said . . . by order of the king."[4]

Other scholars adduce the morphological association between Heb. *ṣwh* and Arab. *wṣy* (metathesis) together with their similar meaning, "entrust, recommend, obligate, etc.,"[5] meanings also attested in biblical texts, as well as the meaning "entrust to someone's care" (cf. Gen. 12:20) and "appoint as trustee, guardian" (cf. 2 S. 6:21; 1 K. 1:35).[6]

The Heb. verb *ṣwh* corresponds to Egyp. *wḏ,* which in various expressions (absolute, with objects, in fixed expressions, etc.) attests the basic meaning "command, order," "issue/relay a command."[7]

II. Biblical Occurrences, Syntax, Stylistic Considerations, Semantic Field. At first glance this Hebrew verb seems to represent a relatively pale term in the Bible, a rather inexact term of little relevance. In order for its contours to emerge more clearly, the word requires a thorough examination on the basis of syntax, stylistic considerations, and semantic field.

1. The verb *ṣwh* occurs 494 times in the MT, 485 in the piel and 9 in the pual. These occurrences are not evenly distributed. In the Pentateuch the piel occurs 246 times (26 in Genesis, 53 in Exodus, 33 in Leviticus, 46 in Numbers, 88 in Deuteronomy), the pual 6 times; 115 times in the Dtr History (43 in Joshua, 6 in Judges, 29 in Samuel, 37 in Kings); the piel occurs 60 times in the prophets and the pual 3 times (notably 10 in Isaiah, 39 in Jeremiah, 3 times in the piel and 3 in the pual in Ezekiel, 5 in Amos); 64 times in the Writings (notably 15 in the Psalms, 9 in Esther, 7 in Nehemiah, 20 in Chronicles). Hence more than half of all occurrences are found in the Pentateuch, with a particular concentration in Deuteronomy. More than half of all occurrences in the prophetic books are concentrated in the book of Jeremiah, which was edited by Dtr redactors. Strikingly, the verb *ṣwh* does not occur at all in the wisdom writings.

The only noun derivative of this root is → מצוה *miṣwâ.*

---

1. Lines 6-8; Y. Aharoni, *Arad Inscriptions* (Jerusalem, 1981), 37.
2. See II.5 below.
3. See A. Lemaire, *Les Ostraca hébreux de l'époque royale Israelite* (Paris, 1973), 181.
4. *AP* 37.13-14; cf. by contrast H. Bauer and P. Leander, *Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen* (1927; repr. 1962), §43j'; *DNSI,* II, 966.
5. Wehr, 1075.
6. Kopf, 162, 197-98.
7. See *WbÄS,* I, 394ff.

2. The usual subjects of this verb are God (Yahweh, less frequently *'elōhîm;* in Isa. 48:5 the gods) and people (generally men; women only in Gen. 27:8; Ruth 3:6; Est. 4:5,10,17). The most important subject of *ṣwh* is clearly God, including 270 times in the piel (also *peh yhwh* in Isa. 34:16) and 5 in the pual. God is the subject 147 times in the Pentateuch (8 times in Genesis, 7 of those in the primeval history; 47 in Exodus; 22 in Leviticus; 36 in Numbers; 34 in Deuteronomy), 47 times in the prophets (notably 5 in Isaiah; 23 in Jeremiah, including 17 in chs. 1–26; 3 in Ezekiel; 4 in Amos), and 38 times in the Writings (notably 15 times in the Psalms [no other subjects in the Psalms], 5 in Nehemiah, 12 in Chronicles).

In order of frequency, human subjects of the verb include Moses (86 times; 72 in the Pentateuch, of which 53 are in Deuteronomy; also 10 in Joshua; 2 in 2 Kings; 2 in 1 Chronicles); 14 in Joshua (the exclusive subject in this book); David (11 times, 7 in 2 Samuel; 2 in 1 Kings [with one exception, all occurrences are in the accession narrative]; 2 in 1 Chronicles). Alongside David, other kings (of Israel, Judah, or surrounding countries) also represent important subjects of *ṣwh,* including Pharaoh (Gen. 12:20; 47:11; Ex. 1:22; 5:6), Abimelech (Gen. 26:11), Saul (1 S. 18:22; 21:3[Eng. 2], Solomon (1 K. 2:43; 5:31[17]), Hiram (1 K. 5:20[6]), the king of Aram (1 K. 22:31; 2 Ch. 18:30), Ahaz (2 K. 16:15), Hezekiah (Isa. 38:1), Josiah (2 K. 22:12; 23:21; 2 Ch. 34:20), Nebuzaradan (Jer. 39:11), Ahasuerus (Est. 3:2), Cyrus (Ezr. 4:3), Artaxerxes (Neh. 5:14), and Jehoshaphat (2 Ch. 19:9). Various other persons representing different groups or classes can also be the subject of *ṣwh,* including the patriarchs (9 times in Gen. 12ff.), Joseph (5 times in Gen. 36ff.), priests (Lev. 13:54; 14:4,5,36,40), army officers (cf. Josh. 1:11; 3:3; 2 S. 11:19; 2 K. 11:5,9,15; 2 Ch. 23:8), brothers (Gen. 50:16; 1 S. 20:29), prophets (Jer. 27:4; 32:13; 36:5,8; 51:59), Jonadab (Jer. 35:6,8,10,14,18). In a word, anyone with the power and authority to command or otherwise issue orders to others can function as the subject of *ṣwh.*

Such decisions and orders generally come from God, as is also clearly discernible in those cases in which a human person functions as the subject of *ṣwh* and then as God's mediator or messenger. Moses, Joshua, and the prophets all issue their commands in agreement with Yahweh, and their commission is indeed to relay God's orders or commission. This mediation through Moses or the prophets is emphasized by the expression *b^eyaḏ*-X, i.e., Yahweh commands *(ṣwh)* through Moses (*b^eyaḏ mōšeh,* Ex. 35:29; Lev. 8:36; Nu. 15:23; 36:13[P]; Josh. 14:2; 21:2,8; Jgs. 3:4 [all Dtr]; Neh. 8:14; 9:14) and through the prophets (*b^eyaḏ hann^eḇî'îm,* Ezr. 9:11; cf. 2 Ch. 29:25). This mediation recalls Ezk. 37:7, where the prophet insists he has prophesied as Yahweh had commanded him, *w^enibbē'ṯî ka'^ašer ṣuwwēṯî.* Although the expression *b^eyaḏ hann^eḇî'îm* occurs in only two late texts in connection with the root *ṣwh,* it appears frequently with *dbr* in connection with the prophets in general (cf. 2 K. 17:23; 21:10; 24:2; Ezk. 38:17; Hos. 12:11[10]) or with individual prophets (cf. 1 K. 12:15; 14:8; 15:29; 16:12; 17:16; 2 K. 9:36; 10:10; 14:25; 2 Ch. 10:15; Isa. 20:2; Jer. 37:2). The expression *dibber b^eyaḏ*-X refers to Moses in various places within P (Lev. 10:11; Nu. 17:5[16:40]; 27:23) as well as in Dtr passages (Josh. 20:2; 1 K. 8:53,56), i.e., in the same strata as does *ṣiwwâ b^eyaḏ mōšeh,* suggesting that the expression *b^eyaḏ*-X derives originally from the prophetic tradition, whence it then moved into other OT traditions as well. At

issue here is thus especially the mediation of words, and from this perspective it becomes clear that Moses is viewed not only as a teacher of the law as might be suggested by the verb *ṣwh,* but also as a messenger with all the characteristics of a prophet. Furthermore, *ṣwh* can refer not only to the mediation of divine messages, but also to the mediation of the messages of other people (cf. Gen. 32:5,18,20[4,17,19]; 50:16).

3. Several syntactical and stylistic observations can be made regarding the direct and indirect objects of *ṣwh.* The object of *ṣwh* is generally introduced by *'eṯ, 'al, 'el,* or *le;* in other cases *ṣwh* is used with a suffix. When God is the subject of *ṣwh,* objects include people and occasionally creatures in heaven or on earth. The first command formulated with *ṣwh* that God issues to human beings is directed to Adam in paradise (Gen. 2:16; cf. 3:11,17). In the primeval history, God issues four commands to Noah formulated with *ṣwh* (6:22; 7:5,9,16). Only once in Genesis is *'elōhîm* the subject of *ṣwh,* namely, when God issues an order to Abraham (21:4; cf. 17:12,19). In Exodus and Numbers Moses is the immediate (albeit not always the last) recipient of divine commands or commissions (64 times, including 50 with *'eṯ-mōšeh,* once with *'el-mōšeh,* 13 times with a suffix). Strikingly, 50 occurrences of *'eṯ-mōšeh* belong to P.[8] The expression *ṣiwwâ 'eṯ-mōšeh* occurs only 12 additional times (2 in Deuteronomy, 6 in Joshua, 1 in 2 Kings, 2 in Nehemiah, 1 in 2 Chronicles). In a series of occurrences involving what one might call "relays,"[9] God commissions Moses to relay a command to Aaron or his sons (Lev. 6:2[9]) or to other Israelites (Lev. 24:2; Nu. 5:2; 28:2; 34:2; 35:2). All these texts come from the hand of P, and all exhibit a similar structure: *ṣwh* impv. + *'eṯ*-X. To this textual complex (assembled by Rendtorff) one might also add Ex. 27:20 (P) with the imperfect (cf. also Dt. 2:4 and Josh. 3:8; 2 K. 20:1 par. Isa. 38:1). In Deuteronomy divine orders formulated with *ṣwh* are generally directed to Moses or to the people, in Joshua also to Joshua himself, and in the prophetic writings also to the prophets.

When people are the subject of *ṣwh,* a relationship emerges between the person issuing the order and the person receiving it, between the superior and subordinated parties. Parents issue commands to their children (cf. Gen. 18:19; 27:8; 28:1; 49:33; 50:16, etc.), masters to their servants (32:18,20[17,19]; 50:2; 1 S. 18:22, etc.), or army officers to their soldiers (cf. Josh. 1:10; 8:4; 2 S. 11:19, etc.). Battle situations and wars, of course, constitute special situations for the issuing of orders (cf. Josh. 6:10; 2 S. 18:5,12; 1 K. 2:46, etc.).

4. The verb *ṣwh* appears frequently in relative clauses with *'ašer* and with comparative formulations such as *ka'ašer* and *kekol-'ašer.* In Ex. 34:18 *'ašer* functions as a comparative particle.[10] Such relative and comparative formulas are generally quite brief, functioning in many instances merely to recall a command that has already been issued or to show that this command has been fulfilled.

8. See III.1.b below.
9. See Rendtorff, 68-69.
10. *GK,* §161b.

The comparative formulas are generally construed in the perfect. Of 97 occurrences with *ka'ᵃšer* (93 in the piel, 4 in the pual) and 38 with *kᵉḵol 'ᵃšer* (all piel), only 2 use the participle (Nu. 32:25; Dt. 30:2) and 2 the future (Josh. 1:18; 2 S. 9:11); all others are construed as perfect. By contrast, tense varies in the relative clauses, especially in the group of texts using *'ᵃšer* + participle.[11]

Even though these occurrences are distributed throughout the OT, comparative formulations are found largely in P traditions (of 135 occurrences, 68 are in P), whereas the relative particle + ptcp. is found almost exclusively in Deuteronomy (32 of 34 occurrences; also 5 occurrences with *'al-kēn . . . miṣwâ,* all in Deuteronomy, then also the participial formulation in Dt. 26:16). The imperative formulations in P generally have God as their subject (63 of 68 occurrences), while participial formulations have Moses as their subject (with two exceptions: Ex. 34:11 with Yahweh; Gen. 27:8 with Rebekah). Hence we encounter here a usage that is clearly peculiar to P and to Dtn/Dtr authors.[12]

Other frequent formulations include the *wᵉyiqṭōl* of *ṣwh.* The formula *wayᵉṣaw* occurs 48 times in the MT, including 22 in the Pentateuch and 17 in the Dtr History. In 32 instances this formulation is complemented by *lē'mōr,* and in 3 instances by *wᵉ'āmartā.* In contrast to a large number of relative and comparative formulations that refer back to something previous, the formulas *wayᵉṣaw . . . lē'mōr* and *wᵉ'āmartā* anticipate something to follow. With the exception of Gen. 2:16 and Dt. 31:23, the subject here is always a person.

5. The semantic field of *ṣwh* is shaped essentially by a series of substantives, the most frequent being *miṣwâ* and *dāḇār* in either the singular or the plural. The term *miṣwâ* functions 39 times in this capacity in the MT (2 in Leviticus-Numbers [P]; 25 in Deuteronomy; 9 in Joshua-2 Kings; 1 in Jeremiah; 2 in Nehemiah), while *dāḇār/dᵉḇārîm* is used 25 times in connection with *ṣwh* (11 in Exodus-Numbers [10 of which are P]; 5 in Deuteronomy; 5 in Joshua-2 Kings; 3 in Jeremiah; 1 in Zechariah; 1 in Nehemiah). These passages clearly reveal the distinction between the two terms, especially within the Pentateuch. While *dāḇār* characterizes the P tradition, *miṣwâ* is predominant in Deuteronomy. In the P tradition 8 of 10 passages use the formula *zeh haddāḇār 'ᵃšer ṣiwwâ yhwh* (Ex. 16:16,32; 35:4; Lev. 8:5; 9:6; 17:2; Nu. 30:2[1]; 36:6); 2 others (Ex. 35:1; Lev. 8:36) use a construction with *dᵉḇārîm.* The formula *zeh haddāḇār 'ᵃšer ṣiwwâ yhwh* is typical of P and has no strict parallels in the rest of the OT; it refers to a divine command in an extremely concrete, well-defined case. By contrast, the term *miṣwâ/miṣwôṯ* refers to the Decalog revealed at Horeb and to the accompanying commandments (cf. Dt. 4:40; 6:1,2,17,25; 7:11; 8:1,11; 10:13; 11:8,13,22,27; 13:19[18]; 15:5; 19:9; 26:13; 27:1,10; 28:1,13,15; 30:8,11; 31:5). This association with the divine commandments in general is preserved especially in the Dtr and related traditions (cf. Josh. 22:5; Jgs. 3:4; 1 S. 13:13; 1 K. 2:43; 8:58; 13:21; 2 K. 17:13,34;

11. See III.2.a below.
12. See III.2 below.

18:6; Neh. 1:7; 9:14; Jer. 35:16). In Lev. 27:34 and Nu. 36:13, both of which derive from P, the *miṣwôṯ* function as a correlative to a relative clause with *ṣwh* and occur in the final verses of these books, where they function to summarize the entire preceding material.

In many of these passages, the term *miṣwâ/miṣwôṯ* is associated with *ḥuqqîm* and/or *mišpāṭîm,* substantives semantically analogous to *miṣwâ* (cf. esp. 1 Ch. 22:13).

The term → תורה *tôrâ* is also used fairly frequently with *ṣwh,* though its meaning can vary. In Josh. 22:5; 2 K. 17:13,34; and Neh. 9:14, it is associated with *miṣwâ* and has a meaning similar to the latter. 2 K. 14:6 and Neh. 8:1 speak about a book[13] of the torah of Moses, and Josh. 1:7; 2 K. 21:8; and Mal. 3:22(4:4) speak about the torah commanded *(ṣwh)* by Moses. 1 Ch. 16:40 speaks similarly about Yahweh's torah "that he commanded Israel," and Neh. 8:14 combines two different formulas in reference to "the law, which Yahweh had commanded by the hand of Moses." Some texts in P use the term *tôrâ* only in reference to a particular regulation (cf. Lev. 7:37-38; Nu. 19:2; 31:21).

The term → ברית *b^eríṯ* is of considerable significance in connection with *ṣwh.* It can be used alone (Dt. 4:13; Josh. 7:11; 23:16; Jgs. 2:20), in the expression *diḇrê habb^eríṯ* (Dt. 28:69[29:1]; Jer. 11:3-4,8), or together with other terms for "law" (cf. 1 K. 11:11; 2 K. 18:12).

The term → דרך *dereḵ* in connection with *ṣwh* is used in passages concerned with covenant breach and renewal (cf. Ex. 32:8; Dt. 9:12,16). These three passages address the deviation *(sûr)* from the way commanded by Yahweh *(dereḵ + ṣwh;* cf. in this regard Dt. 11:28; 31:29). By contrast, Dt. 5:33; 13:6(5); 1 K. 8:58; and Jer. 7:23 exhort the Israelites to follow *(hālaḵ)* the path that Yahweh commanded, a path essentially coincident with the commandments, the law, and the covenant.

Finally the term *'ēḏûṯ*[14] is used together with *ṣwh* (cf. Dt. 6:17,20). These passages also establish a connection with other legal terms.

This survey shows clearly that the semantic field of the verb *ṣwh,* especially in P and Dtn/Dtr strata, refers to the commandments, the law, or the covenant with God, more specifically to commandments or the law that God addresses to his people directly or by way of mediators such as Moses or other persons. These findings coincide completely with observations in other texts in which *ṣwh* is used together with some of the terms discussed above (cf. Dt. 15:15; 24:18,22; 33:4; 1 K. 11:10; 13:9; Ps. 111:9; 119:138; Jer. 7:23; cf. also Ps. 119:4, *'attâ [yhwh] ṣiwwîṯâ piqquḏeyḵā*).

6. The previous discussion alluded to the introductory or concluding function of several formulas using *ṣwh.* We will now examine those formulations that follow immediately upon such introductory formulations with *ṣwh.* The nature of the verb itself suggests that it might be followed by imperatives or prohibitives with admonitions or exhortations, and such is indeed the case in a large number of passages (e.g., Gen. 44:1;

---

13. → ספר *sēper.*
14. → עוד *'wd.*

Josh. 1:10; 4:17; 18:8; 1 S. 18:22; 2 K. 17:27; 22:12; 23:21; 2 Ch. 34:20; Jer. 39:11). Here the construction *wayᵉṣaw . . . lēʾmōr*[15] is followed by an imperative, as is also the case following the formulation *zeh haddāḇār ʾᵃšer ṣiwwâ yhwh* in Ex. 16:16,32; 35:4 (cf. Nu. 19:2; the impv. can also be replaced by an inf. abs. to express the command; cf. Dt. 1:16; 27:1; 31:25). To express the prohibitive, *ṣwh . . . lēʾmōr* is followed by *lōʾ* + impf. (cf. Gen. 2:16-17; 3:17; 28:1,6; Ex. 5:6) or by *ʾal* + jussive (cf. Ex. 36:6). Such admonitions and commands also include Josh. 4:3 and 2 S. 13:28, both introduced with an imperative (*śᵉʾû*, "pick up," and *rᵉʾû*, "watch"), as well as Josh. 1:9; 1 K. 2:1; 2 Ch. 19:9. Finally one might note that commands can also be delivered by messengers and introduced by the messenger formula *kōh ʾāmar* (cf. Gen. 32:5[4]; 50:16).

7. We will examine only those semantically related terms that are particularly characteristic. In many instances *ṣwh* is accompanied by the verb → אמר *ʾāmar* in order to indicate direct address, a commission, or an instruction, either as an infinitive with *lᵉ* (cf. Gen. 3:17; Ex. 35:4; Lev. 6:2[9]; 8:31; Nu. 19:2; Dt. 1:16; 2:4; 3:18,21; 19:7; Josh. 1:11,13; 3:8; 4:3; 6:10; 1 K. 22:31; 2 K. 11:5; 17:35; 2 Ch. 25:4; Jer. 7:23; 27:4; 35:6)[16] or in the imperfect consecutive (cf. Gen. 28:1; 49:29; Nu. 32:28-29; Dt. 31:23; 2 K. 11:15; 1 Ch. 22:6-7).

In addition to the basic function of commanding or commissioning, the verb *ṣwh* also functions to confirm whether that command has been executed. The formal structure "command — execution" emerges, generally reflected in the construction "X did as Y had commanded," though the verb "do, act" can be replaced by a more specific verb associated directly or in a more general fashion with the command itself. In the first instance, e.g., when marching orders are issued during war, the expression is "X set out *(hālaḵ)* as Y had ordered *(ṣwh)*" (cf. Dt. 1:19; 1 S. 17:20). In the second instance the more general verb *ʿāśâ* is used, e.g., in the expression "X did *(ʿāśâ)* as Y had commanded *(ṣwh)*" (cf., e.g., Gen. 7:5; 50:12; Ex. 7:20; 29:35; Lev. 8:4; 9:7; Nu. 2:34; 27:22; Dt. 26:14; 31:5; Josh. 4:8; 11:15; 2 S. 9:11; 13:29; 2 K. 11:9; 21:8; 2 Ch. 23:8; Est. 4:17; Jer. 32:23; 50:21). This relationship is often specified even further by the sequence *ṣwh . . . kēn ʿāśâ*, an expression characteristic of P.[17]

Two verbs are associated directly with *ṣwh* (and sometimes with each other as well): → שמר *šāmar* and → שמע *šāmaʿ*, and occur especially in the Dtn/Dtr tradition in connection with obedience to divine commandments. The term *šāmar* frequently appears with *ṣwh* in connection with *miṣwâ* and in several instances with *ḥuqqîm* and *mišpāṭîm* (cf. Ex. 34:11; Dt. 5:32; 12:28; 13:1[12:32]; 24:8; 32:46; Jgs. 13:14; 1 S. 13:14; 1 K. 9:4; 11:10; Jer. 35:18).[18] In Ps. 119:4 the psalmist says, "you have commanded *(ṣiwwâ)* your precepts *(piqquḏîm)* to be kept *(šāmar)* diligently." The sequence *ṣiwwâ — šāmar* is used in such texts to admonish the people to follow the commandments. The verb *šāmaʿ* appears together with *ṣwh* especially in the expressions *šāmaʿ bᵉqōl* (cf. Gen.

15. See II.4 above.
16. Concerning the formula *wayᵉṣaw . . . lēʾmōr,* see II.4 above.
17. See III.1.a below.
18. See in this regard also the texts in II.5.

27:8; Dt. 30:2; Josh. 22:2b; Jer. 35:8) and *šāma' miṣwôṯ* (Dt. 11:13,27,28), or in an expression combining the two (cf. Dt. 28:1,13,15). Such passages also include 1 K. 11:38; Jer. 11:3-4; 35:8,10,16,18.

The word field of *ṣwh* also includes *dāḇār*[19] and *dibber.* Because these texts exhibit a special meaning, we will examine them separately.[20]

The notions of "sending" and "commanding" are directly associated in the sense of messenger and message, a connection emerging clearly in texts associating *šālaḥ* and *ṣwh* (cf. Ex. 4:28; 1 S. 21:3[2]; Isa. 10:6; Jer. 14:14; 23:32; 27:3-4).

III. Characteristic Expressions.

1. *Priestly Writing.* a. The P texts use *ṣwh* quite frequently, particularly with comparative formulations using *ka'ᵃšer* or *kᵉḵol 'ᵃšer ṣiwwâ* and with God as the subject of *ṣwh.* This formula appears throughout the Pentateuch, from the primeval history (Gen. 6:22; 7:16) and the history of Abraham (21:4) on to Dt. 1:3 and 34:9, passages generally ascribed to P. The center of the use of this formula is in Exodus-Numbers, especially in the Sinai pericope (Ex. 19–Nu. 10), where 41 of the 64 occurrences in P are found. These sections involve the tent of meeting (Ex. 29:35; 31:11; 39:1,5,7,21,26, 29,31-32,42-43; 40:16,19,21,23,25,27,29,32), priestly consecration (Lev. 8:4,9,13,17, 21,29; 9:7,10; 10:15), and congregational issues such as purity, the cult, and holiness (cf. Lev. 16:34; 24:23; Nu. 1:19,54; 2:33-34; 3:42,51; 8:3,20,22; 9:5). The expression occurs less frequently toward the beginning of the book of Exodus (Ex. 7:6,10,20, the Egyptian plagues; 12:28,50, Passover), in sections involving the wilderness wanderings (Ex. 16:34; Nu. 15:36; 17:26[11]), and finally the land conquest (Nu. 20:27; 26:4; 27:11,22; 30:1; 31:7,31,41,47; 36:10).

The semantic valence of these formulas emerges with particular clarity in the 14 texts in which the comparison *ka'ᵃšer/kᵉḵol 'ᵃšer* is completed by *kēn 'āśâ/'āśû* (Gen. 6:22; Ex. 7:6; 12:28,50; 39:32,42-43; 40:16; Nu. 1:54; 8:20,22; 9:5; 17:26[11]; 36:10). Although the association of *ṣwh* with *'āśâ* occurs frequently in the OT,[21] this construction appears exclusively in the P literature. Although the construction does appear once more in Josh. 14:5, this text itself belongs to the section comprising 13:15–14:5 whose vocabulary and style clearly derive from P; indeed, some scholars have proposed a connection between this text and the texts in Genesis-Numbers;[22] significantly, Josh. 14:5 refers to a divine commission to Moses rather than to Joshua (cf. 13:7).[23] The consistent repetition of these formulations in central P traditions and the exclusive use of certain sentences *(kēn 'āśâ/'āśû)* strongly suggest that the authors or redactors had a pronounced theological agenda in these texts.

b. According to Elliger, the fulfillment of divine commandments constitutes a constant structure in the P tradition; this assertion can be clearly demonstrated in a series

19. See II.5.
20. See III.3 below.
21. See II.7.
22. See G. E. Wright, in Wright and R. G. Boling, *Joshua. AB* 6 (1982), 58, 67-68.
23. See M. Noth, *Das Buch Joshua. HAT* I/7 (1971), 83.

of P texts (Gen. 17:11-12/23; Ex. 14:16/21-22; 14:26/27-28; Nu. 13:1-2/3,17; 20:7-8/9-10; 20:23,25-26/27-28; 27:18-21/22-23). Another series of passages involves obedience to commandments, albeit without providing as much detail (Gen. 6:22; Ex. 12:28; 14:4), while other texts combine the two forms (Nu. 20:27; 27:22).[24] The formulas *ka'ᵃšer/kᵉḵol 'ᵃšer ṣiwwâ* belong to the second group, a group portraying obedience to divine commands in a more general and less colorful fashion. Despite their general character, however, they are based on an extremely concrete theological conception representative of P theology.

In the primeval and patriarchal history, the P redactor first uses the verb *ṣwh* in three comparative formulas with God as the subject and Noah or Abraham as the immediate object. The programmatic character of this use is immediately apparent in that the commands are directed to the entire human race (Gen. 6:22; 7:16) or to the entire people of God (21:4).

In the introduction and conclusion (Gen. 6:13-22; 9:1-7), R^P structures the Flood Narrative as a discourse God delivers to Noah in which the flood and its consequences (7:6-24) constitute the focal point. Noah is portrayed as an upright man who lives in accordance with God's will (6:9). In the Priestly theological vision, the most important aspect of this story is not the events themselves, but the divine discourse that moves history and sets these events in motion in the first place, and accordingly also the human response to that discourse. Hence it is important that Noah obeys the divine commandment in building the ark and then enters it: *kᵉḵol 'ᵃšer/ka'ᵃšer ṣiwwâ 'ōṯô 'ᵉlōhîm* (6:22; 7:16). God speaks, and people listen; God commands, and they obey. This sequence is the most important element for P. What we have here is "a graphic picture of Noah working devotedly, with complete faith in all that the Almighty God had told him, and in absolute obedience to the word of his creator."[25] P is especially interested in the actual entry into the ark itself since this entry illustrates Noah's obedience to the divine word; in this obedience Noah effects his own rescue and, by extension, that of humankind itself. Entry into the ark "assures future life, and puts it all under the obedience theme."[26] Noah's obedience to the divine command alters the entire path of humankind, which hitherto had pursued its own destruction. This obedience creates a new relationship between God and human beings, a relationship then articulated in what is known as the Noahide Covenant. According to Westermann, "the entrance of the obedient, pious man into the place of salvation or preservation" constitutes "a very reserved and distant hint of the entrance into the sanctuary," a central motif of P.[27]

P also structures the Abraham story according to the schema command — obedience, this time with reference to circumcision. Gen. 17:23 offers a detailed account of the precise fulfillment of the divine order (vv. 11-12; a subsequent reference appears in 21:4). This textual unit combines the schemata promise — commandment — obedience with the theme of covenant. Within the covenant, God's fulfillment of the promise

24. See Elliger, 129-30.
25. U. Cassuto, *Genesis*, 2 vols. (Eng. trans. 1978), I, 71.
26. McEvenue, 61.
27. C. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11* (Eng. trans. 1984), 436.

corresponds to Abraham's obedience to the command. "The essence of the theology of the priestly writing expresses itself in all its clearness in this chapter."[28] This association of promise and commandment becomes programmatic both in reference to the schema commandment — obedience and in reference to the character of the promise itself, which according to 17:8 applies to "all the land of Canaan"; precisely this programmatic association then becomes one of P's favorite expressions, especially in Numbers.[29]

With regard to both structure and scope, the Sinai pericope constitutes the center of P.[30] The same applies without qualification also to P's use of the verb *ṣwh,* especially as regards the comparative formulation.

The experience at Sinai was constitutive for the people of God, and P's concern is to show how all the laws derive from that Sinaitic experience. That concern also explains the enormous accretion of priestly material (Ex. 25–Nu. 10) immediately following the original Sinai narrative in Ex. 19–24, even though that material interrupts the wilderness wanderings.

This large section deals primarily with cultic matters. Ex. 25–31 portrays the construction of the wilderness sanctuary, the consecration of priests, and the presentation of offerings. Ex. 35–40 constitutes the counterpart to chs. 25–31 in the form of the actual execution of the commandments God issues to Moses.

The association of the sanctuary traditions with the Sinai tradition is accentuated by the demand that the sanctuary itself be built "exactly according to the model he revealed to Moses on the mountain." This formula is repeated several times (cf. 25:9,40; 26:8,30; 27:8) and finds its counterpart in chs. 35–40 in the assertion that it was indeed done *ka'ašer ṣiwwâ yhwh 'eṯ-mōšeh* (7 times in ch. 39, 7 more in ch. 40) or *kᵉḵol 'ašer ṣiwwâ yhwh 'eṯ-mōšeh* (39:32,42; 40:16). This formula functions to trace the construction of the wilderness sanctuary in all its details back to God's explicit orders to Moses; every detail of the plan was implemented according to Yahweh's order to Moses. The legitimacy of the wilderness sanctuary derives from God's own will, and God's presence in the pillar of fire and cloud (40:34-38) confirms this institution as being of divine origin. Here the schema commandment — implementation functions to perfection. Moses mediates the divine orders, while Bezalel and Oholiab do the actual construction. The entire people as voluntary workers exemplify true obedience to the divine commandments.

The notion of holiness is not only determinative for P especially in the book of Leviticus, but also closely related to fulfillment of the divine will. It requires separation as well as consecration and loyal worship. The demands of holiness God makes on his cultic servants can be seen in the sudden death of the two sons of Aaron, who had done something Yahweh had not commanded (*'ašer lō' ṣiwwâ 'ōṯām,* Lev. 10:1). Indeed, it is precisely in the cultic sphere that Yahweh's commands must be followed with particu-

28. C. Westermann, *Genesis 12–36* (Eng. trans. 1985), 256.
29. Cortese, *La terra di Canaan.*
30. Cortese, *Da Mosè a Esdra,* 107.

lar care. According to the P tradition, the priesthood in Israel commences with Aaron; the priestly consecration of both Aaron and his sons (Lev. 8ff.) must accord perfectly with God's commands (Ex. 29:35) because it is that consecration alone that makes practice of the cult possible in the first place. The manifestation of God's presence before the entire people as the culmination of this first official act following the priestly consecration (Lev. 9:23-24) shows that God has accepted the offering. In context this acceptance means that everything was done *ka'ᵃšer ṣiwwâ yhwh.* This formulation recurs 9 times in Lev. 8–10 in connection with the installation of the priesthood and the presentation of offerings to emphasize the loyalty of Moses, Aaron, and the priests toward the divine word. The breach of the schema command — disobedience by Nadab and Abihu, Aaron's sons, is put right by the loyal obedience of Aaron and the other priests. This schema now dominates the theology of P both in the description of the wilderness wanderings (Ex. 15:22–18:27; Nu. 10:11–20:13) and in the preparations for the land conquest (Nu. 20:14–36:13) and on up to the death of Moses. Toward the end of P (Dt. 34:9), the formula *ka'ᵃšer ṣiwwâ yhwh 'eṯ-mōšeh* appears for the last time in the Pentateuch where the positive reaction of the people to their new leader is viewed as an act of obedience to a divine commission.

The frequent repetition of the verb *ṣwh,* especially in the formulas discussed above, precisely reflects the theological conviction of P that only unconditional obedience accords with the holiness of the divine will. Here Israel emerges as a community consecrated to God's cult, a community in which God regulates even the smallest details. The community's holiness depends on its faithfulness to the divine word in its holy ordinances.

2. *Deuteronomy.* Deuteronomy contains a group of formulas some scholars have called "promulgation statements,"[31] actually relative clauses generally following one or several terms for "law."[32] Such substantives are not found in Dt. 5:12,16,32; 6:25; 10:5; 12:21; 20:17; 26:14 (or in Ex. 34:11 and Dt. 12:14), texts closely resembling the "implementation formulas" in the P tradition (cf. Ex. 7:6,10; 12:28,50).[33] De Vries believes that these formulas function differently here than in the P tradition and prefers to call them "authentication formulas."[34] Even if we do not agree with all the details of de Vries's interpretation, we do acknowledge the unique character of this particular group of formulas.

a. "Promulgation statements" are formulas promulgating those divine commandments that the people of Israel must fulfill upon entering the land of Canaan. With the exception of five texts with *dibber* (4:45; 5:1), *lmd* piel (5:31), *nāṯan lip̄nê* (11:32), and *šāmar* (12:1), all these formulas contain the verb *ṣiwwâ* (in the ptcp. or perf.; in Dt. 18:18, in the impf., with extremely peculiar undertones[35]).

31. Lohfink, 59-63.
32. See II.5 above.
33. Lohfink, 59.
34. De Vries, 311ff.
35. De Vries, 311; Lohfink, 61, 298; see III.3 below.

The participial formulation of the promulgation statements constitutes a fixed cliché with few variants: *ᵃšer ʾānōḵî mᵉṣawwᵉḵā hayyôm* (Ex. 34:11; 18 times in Deuteronomy: 4:40; 6:6; 7:11; 8:1,11; 10:13; 11:8; 13:19[18]; 15:5; 19:9; 27:10; 28:1,13,15; 30:2,8,11,16; the same formulation without *hayyôm* in 6:2; 12:14,28); the formula *ᵃšer ʾānōḵî mᵉṣawweh ʾeṯkem* (4:2; 11:22; 12:11; 13:1[12:32]; the same formulation with *hayyôm* in 11:13,27-28; 27:1,4; 28:14); similar formulations with the ptcp. of *ṣwh* but not belonging to this group of promulgation formula are found in 15:11,15; 19:7; 24:18,22: *ʿal-kēn ʾānōḵî mᵉṣawwᵉḵā [hayyôm]* and in 26:16: *hayyôm hazzeh yhwh ʾᵉlōheḵā mᵉṣawwᵉḵā*. Throughout Deuteronomy the promulgation formula has Moses as its subject (only in Ex. 34:11 is it Yahweh) and the people of Israel as its addressee. Accordingly, it is Moses who at the boundary of the promised land presents the law to the people.

In contradistinction to the participial formulations, the promulgation formulas with *ṣwh* in the perfect all have Yahweh as their subject (Dt. 4:13,23; 5:33; 6:1,17,20; 9:12,16; 13:6[5]; 26:13-14; 28:45,69[29:1][36]). In 17:3 it is not clear whether Yahweh or Moses is the subject.[37] Only in 31:5,29 is Moses the subject of a promulgation formula in the perfect.

b. The intent of the authentication formulas is to inculcate the necessity of carrying out or implementing something in accordance with a divine ordinance. These formulas, too, are construed with *ṣwh* in the perfect and always (excepting 12:21) with Yahweh as the subject. In contradistinction to the promulgation formulas, however, the authentication formulas basically begin with *kaʾᵃšer* (Dt. 4:5; 5:12,16,32; 6:25; 20:17; 24:8; de Vries adds 18:20, but it begins with *ʾᵃšer* rather than with *kaʾᵃšer* and belongs thematically to a different group of formulas[38]).

c. These findings show that both the participial formulations and those in the perfect share certain similarities and yet also differ in various ways in both promulgation and authentication. On the basis of differences in form and content, de Vries speaks of an independent development in which the participial formula represents the earliest form.[39] Although this suggestion is indeed true, it must be explained differently. His arguments especially regarding the age and original status of the promulgation formula in Dt. 6:6 are not persuasive, since precisely this text shows that the promulgation formula is not the oldest and derives rather from an even earlier formula.[40] Hence the promulgation formula in 6:6 itself already contains a stereotypical cliché just as in all the other texts in Deuteronomy that were added secondarily.[41] All the evidence suggests that these formulas have a common, pre-Dtn origin, and the various differences indicate an independent development within tradition history. The earliest formulation that

36. De Vries, 312-13, adds 1:3 and 17:3; Dt. 1:3, however, like 34:9, belongs to P (see Skweres, 19-20 n. 106), and formally they resemble the P formulas. See III.1 above.

37. See Lohfink, 61-62.

38. See III.3 below.

39. De Vries, 315.

40. De Vries, 309-10, 315.

41. See García López, *RB* 85 (1978) 164-67.

could have influenced Deuteronomy (formulas either with the ptcp. or in the perf.) is the one in Ex. 34:11. On the one hand, this formulation is construed with the participle; on the other, its subject is Yahweh. In an exhaustive analysis of the vocabulary and formulaic language of Ex. 34:11-16, Langlamet has demonstrated both the age and the originality of 34:11a *(ʾašer ʾānōḵî meṣawweḵā hayyôm)* among the formulas in Deuteronomy. In Ex. 34:11a, where the divine "I" is revealed, one can see the "cultic and theophanic roots of the 'reading of the law' at its very source."[42] Halbe came to a similar conclusion from a different perspective.[43] Hence the participial formulation in Ex. 34:11a influenced the promulgation formulas in Deuteronomy; through the course of their own tradition history, the latter were then subject to variations.[44] Commensurate with the Moses fiction in Deuteronomy, the "I" in the formulas must basically become the "I" of Moses himself in contradistinction to that in Ex. 34:11a. On the other hand, the Dtn formula construed in the perfect and generally with Yahweh as subject similarly derives from Ex. 34:11a, a text particularly emphasizing Yahweh's sovereignty, which in its own turn provides the foundation for the urgent admonition to obey the divine commandment.[45]

In its original form, Deuteronomy constituted a book of laws promulgated by Moses (cf. 2 K. 22:18; Dt. 4:45) containing parenetic legal sections in the singular in chs. 6–28. Historical sections were later appended to both the beginning and the end of the book (chs. 1–3 + 29–34) along with references to the events at Horeb (ch. 5 and 9:7–10:11). In these sections Horeb occupied the foreground, and even the book of Deuteronomy clothed itself anew in accommodation to ancient oriental contracts. The covenant between God and his people was made at Horeb, and the basic law of Horeb is the Decalog, which Moses received directly from God's hands. Both Horeb and, even more concretely, the Decalog amplify the parenesis and law of proto-Deuteronomy.[46] While the "I" of Moses leaps to the forefront in the participial promulgation formulas, in the formulas construed in the perfect the reference is to Horeb,[47] and Yahweh thus takes center stage. In this view Yahweh appears as the lawgiver and Moses as the mediator. Moses' task is to promulgate and implement the law of Horeb in Moab, which is why the expression *hayyôm* appears so frequently in the participial formulation. God's voice at Horeb, so distant from the people themselves (cf. 5:23ff.), now approaches closer through the mediation of Moses (cf. 5:27ff.), and thus not only do the voices of Yahweh and Moses flow together here, but also the formulations in which these voices come to expression. Thenceforth the two voices can no longer be distinguished. Such is the case in 17:3,[48] where at first glance the "I" refers to Moses; if one compares this text with 18:20; Jer. 7:31; 19:15; 32:35 (texts closely related to Dt. 17:3 in form), how-

42. Langlamet, 329-30; see also 503ff.
43. Halbe, 59-96.
44. See III.2.a above.
45. See Halbe, 95-96.
46. See García López, *RB* 84 (1977) 512-13, 520-21; 85 (1978) 47ff.
47. See Moran, 86; Lohfink, 60ff.
48. See III.2.a above.

ever, the "I" of Yahweh clearly steps into the foreground. Moses is seen to represent and mediate Yahweh's voice; he is God's spokesperson. The people are summoned to obey God's law and will. Ultimately, this schema constitutes the religious and theological message of the forms analyzed here. Moses promulgates God's law and authenticates it as divine.

3. *ṣwh — dbr.* In 18 OT passages the verbs *ṣiwwâ* and *dibber* are intimately related. Most of these passages can be ascribed to P (Ex. 6:13; 7:2; 25:22; 34:32,34; Nu. 27:23; Dt. 1:3) and to Jeremiah (Jer. 1:7,17; 7:22; 14:14; 19:5; 26:2,8; 29:23). The remaining passages are in the prophetic law in Dt. 18:18,20 and in Josh. 4:10. The most important subjects in these sections are on the one hand Yahweh, and on the other Moses and Jeremiah. Less significant subjects include the prophets in general, false prophets, and Joshua.

As regards the subjects and addressees of the verbs *ṣiwwâ — dibber,* three basic combinations occur: (1) Yahweh as the subject of both verbs (Ex. 6:13; 25:22: confirmation; Jer. 7:22; 14:14; 19:5: rejection). (2) Yahweh as the subject of *dibber,* Moses as the subject of *ṣiwwâ,* i.e., Moses mediates what Yahweh has said (Ex. 34:32; Nu. 27:23). (3) Yahweh as the subject of *ṣiwwâ,* Moses or others as the subject of *dibber;* Yahweh commands, and Moses, Jeremiah, or others relay Yahweh's orders (Ex. 7:2; 34:34; Dt. 1:3b; 18:18,20; Josh. 4:10; Jer. 1:7,17; 26:2,8; 29:23). This particular group is predominant semantically and with regard to cited traditions. Four of these texts construe the verbs in the imperfect (in the remaining texts *ṣiwwâ* is always used in a past sense), yielding two different constructions: *tᵉḏabbēr 'ēṯ kol-'ᵃšer 'ᵃṣawweḵā* (Ex. 7:2; Jer. 1:7) and *wᵉḏibber 'ēṯ kol-'ᵃšer 'ᵃṣawweh(-)* (Dt. 18:18; Jer. 1:17). Accordingly, Moses, Jeremiah, and the prophets will all speak after the manner of Moses, namely, "everything that Yahweh commands you," a formulation indicating that Moses or the other prophets like him (e.g., Jeremiah) are in fact commissioned by the Lord. Here too the schema commission — obedience appears (albeit in a different form than earlier[49]). Finally the formula *(wᵉ)dibbar(tā) 'ēṯ kol-'ᵃšer 'ᵃṣawweh(-)* in Jeremiah and Deuteronomy is qualified further by the other formula *(wᵉ)nāṯattî dᵉḇāray bᵉpîḵā* (Dt. 18:18bα; Jer. 1:9bβ). Accordingly, "speaking what God commands" (Dt. 18:18bβ; Jer. 1:7bβ) is equivalent to what Yahweh puts in his mouth.[50] The prophet is ultimately his messenger (Ex. 4:15; 2 S. 14:18-19). Jeremiah defines himself as the "mouth of God" (Jer. 15:19) and understands himself as God's instrument, functioning, like Moses, as a mediator. P expresses this reality with other formulations, e.g., "I will deliver to you all my commands for the Israelites" (Ex. 25:22; cf. 34:32). The function is thus mediation, but through the word; i.e., the true prophet will speak what Yahweh commands (cf. the formulations in the impf.). By contrast, the false prophets proclaim what Yahweh has neither spoken nor commanded (Jer. 14:14; cf. Dt. 18:20). The true prophet remains loyal to God's word, while the arrogant will die because they speak in the name of

49. See III.1 above.
50. See García López, "Election-vocation d'Israël et de Jérémie," *VT* 35 (1985) 10.

Yahweh but not what Yahweh actually commands (cf. Dt. 18:20). Moses and Jeremiah are true prophets because they relay God's word exactly as he commands (cf. Ex. 34:34; Dt. 1:3; Jer. 26:8, formulas with *ṣwh* in the perf.). In this understanding of the prophet, the Jeremianic, Dtn, and P traditions merge.

The question arises whether such an intimate relationship between form and content in different traditions derives ultimately from a common source. The answer is frequently sought on the one hand in the traditions of the northern kingdom, where the roots of Deuteronomy and the Jeremianic proclamation are to be found,[51] traditions from which on the other hand the P tradition also draws. In its accounts of the wilderness sanctuary, P doubtless contains a series of extremely old traditions regarding the "tent of meeting"[52] (cf. Ex. 33:7-11, E). The understanding of the function of Moses, who speaks with God and acts as a mediator (cf. 25:22), also contains extremely old traditions regarding the tasks of Moses (cf. 33:11). The tables of the Decalog to which Dt. 18:15ff. refer are kept in the ark of the covenant (Ex. 25:21; 40:20) as a sign of the continuity between God's revelation in the past and his present revelation to Israel from the ark of the covenant itself (Ex. 25:22).[53]

4. *nāgîḏ* — *ṣwh*. a. The structure of the *nāgîḏ* formulas in Samuel and Kings using the verb *ṣwh* is: verb + subj. (generally Yahweh) + *nāgîḏ* + *'al*-obj. The variable in this formulation is the verb itself, yielding two groups of formulas. The first group uses *māšaḥ* (1 S. 9:16; 10:1),[54] and the second *ṣiwwâ* (1 S. 13:14; 25:30; 2 S. 6:21; 1 K. 1:35), *hāyâ* (2 S. 5:2; 7:8), *nāṯān* (1 K. 14:7; 16:2), and *lāqaḥ* (2 S. 7:8). Despite the use of different verbs, this second group is unified; *nāṯān* and *lāqaḥ* are correlatives, and *hāyâ* emphasizes the final situation (together with *lāqaḥ* in 2 S. 7:8). The term *ṣiwwâ* refers more to a royal or divine resolution in order to prompt a certain course of action.[55] Texts with *ṣwh* in 1/2 Samuel refer to David, those in 1/2 Kings to Solomon. The use of *ṣwh* in 1 S. 13:13-14 is also interesting; in connection with Saul's rejection, the prophet Samuel reports, *biqqēš yhwh lô 'îš kilḇāḇô wayᵉṣawwēhû yhwh lᵉnāgîḏ 'al-'ammô* (v. 14bα). This formulation is itself framed by two additional formulations with *ṣwh: lō' šāmartā 'eṯ-miṣwaṯ yhwh 'ᵉlōheyḵā 'ᵃšer ṣiwwāḵ* (v. 13b) and *kî lō' šāmartā 'ēṯ 'ᵃšer-ṣiwwᵉḵā yhwh* (v. 14bβ-γ). Here the author is playing on the double meaning of *ṣiwwâ* by establishing a connection between what Yahweh has commanded and the appointment as *nāgîḏ:* "He [Saul] has disobeyed Yahweh, or rather Yahweh's prophet. Thus he has violated the terms of his *appointment* as king. Kingship requires obedience."[56]

David will later intervene for Solomon with the same formulation: *wᵉ'ōṯô ṣiwwîṯî lihyôṯ nāgîḏ 'al-yiśrā'ēl wᵉ'al-yᵉhûḏâ* (1 K. 1:35). Here the verb *ṣiwwîṯî* is to be under-

---

51. See García López, "Un profeta," 304ff.
52. → אהל *'ōhel,* I, 118ff.; → מועד *mô'ēḏ,* VIII, 167ff.
53. See J. P. Hyatt, *Exodus. NCBC* (1971), 265; B. S. Childs, *Exodus. OTL* (1974), 540-41.
54. → משׁח *māšaḥ,* IX, 43ff.
55. See Richter, 72-75.
56. P. K. McCarter Jr., *I Samuel. AB* 8 (1980), 230.

stood as *perfectum declarativum* (perf. of coincidence), "and I hereby appoint him to be *nāgîḏ* over Israel."[57]

These texts with the formula *ṣiwwâ . . . nāgîḏ* show that without losing its basic meaning "order, command," *ṣiwwâ* can shift its meaning to "appoint, name, install."

b. A special use of the *nāgîḏ* formulation is found in Isa. 55:3-5. Only in the expression *nāgîḏ ûmᵉṣawwēh lᵉʾummîm* (v. 4b) is *ṣwh* used as the piel participle to refer to a function, namely, as "a leader and commander for the peoples" (preserving the basic meaning of *ṣwh*). Deutero-Isaiah associates Israel's covenant with David and transfers to Israel the title bestowed on David. Just as David once ruled over Israel, so also will Israel now become the commander of the nations. In his victories and conquests, David witnessed to God's power and deeds on behalf of his people. Israel is now analogously appointed to be God's witness among the nations (v. 4; cf. Isa. 43:10; 44:8). Such witness consists in proclamation of Yahweh. Because Israel has experienced God's redeeming power in its own salvation history, it is itself to become a witness to his liberating power. Put briefly, Isa. 55:3-5 is reinterpreting both the figure and function of David.[58]

c. Although the formula *wᵉʿal-ʿam ʿeḇrāṯî ʾᵃṣawwennû* (Isa. 10:6) formally resembles the *nāgîḏ* formula in 1 S. 13:14; 25:30; 2 S. 6:21; 1 K. 1:35, a comparison of the formulations in Samuel-Kings with that in Isa. 10:6 reveals a certain antithetical parallelism. In the first case, Yahweh appoints a *nāgîḏ* to be an instrument of deliverance for his people; in the second, he commissions *(ṣwh)* an Assyrian to be the instrument of chastisement for his people Israel.[59]

5. *Installation Formulas.* a. In Nu. 27:19,23; Dt. 31:14,23; Josh. 1:9; 1 K. 2:1; 1 Ch. 22:6,12; 2 Ch. 19:9, we encounter a formal schema that Porter qualifies as "a definite form of installation to an office or function."[60] These words of installation are described as a ceremonious command, *ṣiwwâ* (cf. 2 S. 7:7, albeit it a text Porter and Williamson do not cite). In this specific context the term expresses admission to a clearly defined office. By contrast, references to appointment to offices that are not clearly defined do not use *ṣwh*. Here *ṣwh* refers to the actions of those with the authority to transfer their power to others.[61] In Numbers, Deuteronomy, and Joshua, Moses transfers his power to Joshua, his successor in leading the Israelite tribes. In 1 Kings/ 1 Chronicles, David transfers the throne to his son Solomon. 2 Ch. 19:8-9 is a bit different. Here Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, appoints priests, Levites, and the heads of families of Israel "to give judgment" and "to decide disputed cases" among his people. One important difference here is that in Numbers (Nu. 27:19,23), Moses is the subject of *ṣiwwâ*, while in Dt. 31:14,23, and Josh. 1:9 it is Yahweh. Similar are 1 K.

---

57. Mettinger, 161-62; see Halpern, 6-7.

58. See Beuken, 55-64; J. L. McKenzie, *Second Isaiah. AB* 20 (1968), 142ff.; Seybold, 155 n. 14.

59. See H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12* (Eng. trans. 1991), 416-17.

60. Porter, 106.

61. Porter, 107-8.

2:1 and 1 Ch. 22:6, where David, and 1 Ch. 22:12, where Yahweh, is the subject of *ṣiwwâ*.[62]

A formal and thematic connection obtains between Josh. 1:7aα and the installation formula in 1:9a. Each hemistich uses the same formulation within a chiastic construction: *raq ḥazaq we'emaṣ me'ōḏ // lišmōr la'aśôṯ keḵol-hattôrâ 'ašer ṣiwweḵā mōšeh . . . halô' ṣiwwîṯîḵā // ḥazaq we'emāṣ* (1:7aα,9aα; cf. also Dt. 3:28: *ṣiwwâ — ḥāzaq — 'āmaṣ*). Changes in the subject of *ṣiwwâ* (Moses in v. 7, Yahweh in v. 9) also change the valence and scope of the verb. V. 9 involves an emphatic declaration used to express the ceremonious installation of Joshua in his office.[63] Nonetheless a connection between these formulas and those in 1 S. 13:13-14 discussed earlier does obtain. The DtrN redactor here plays on the double meaning of the verb in underscoring the connection between installation and success in office on the one hand and obedience to the law on the other (cf. also 1 K. 2:1-4 and 1 Ch. 22:11-13). If these installation formulas do indeed have their background "in the royal practice and administration of the Judaean monarchy,"[64] then their life setting is also analogous to that of the *nāgîḏ* formulations.

b. In 1 K. 2:1b the term *ṣiwwâ* acquires a different meaning. Within the immediate context (*wayyiqreḇû yemê-dāwîḏ lāmûṯ*, v. 1a) and considering the etymological connection between *ṣwh* and Arab. *wṣy*,[65] one might translate 1 K. 2:1b as "give one's last charge"[66] (cf. also Gen. 49:29,33; 50:16; 2 S. 17:23; 2 K. 20:1; Isa. 38:1, texts one can interpret similarly). Formally 1 K. 2:1 more closely resembles Dt. 31:14: *wayyiqreḇû yemê-dāwîḏ lāmûṯ wayeṣaw* (1 K. 2:1), *qāreḇû yāmeḵā lāmûṯ . . . wa'aṣawwenû* (Dt. 31:14). Peculiarly the subject in Dt. 31:14 is Yahweh, who is speaking to Moses, suggesting that when Moses nears death, Yahweh himself gives the last instructions to Joshua. In this context one might also note that David's words to Solomon resonate in Moses' words to Joshua (Dt. 31:23) and in Yahweh's parallel admonition to Joshua (Josh. 1:6-9).

Hence in both 1 K. 2:1 and Dt. 31:14, *ṣiwwâ* serves to express special orders and instructions (both divine and human) directed to a successor in office immediately before the death of the predecessor. Indeed, Joshua is then installed in office in Dt. 31:23.[67]

IV. Yahweh's Sovereign Power in Creation and History. In the OT both creation and the direction of history are the work of God's sovereign power. Yahweh shows himself to be the Lord of creation who also guides the events of history. Hence he can either choose those who are to realize his salvific plans or use the various elements of

62. See Williamson, 354.

63. See Boling, in Wright and Boling, *Joshua*, 125; regarding other differences in the formulas used in vv. 6-9, see Ehrlich, 2-3; Smend, 494-97.

64. Porter, 108; see Williamson, 353-54.

65. See I above.

66. See J. Gray, *I & II Kings. OTL* (²1970), 99.

67. See G. von Rad, *Deuteronomy. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1966), 187-89.

nature as instruments to implement those plans. Used in this context, *ṣiwwâ* does not lose its basic meaning of "command" while yet acquiring different semantic nuances and its own theological import under the influence of the various settings.

1. Isa. 45:11-21 is a programmatic passage using *ṣwh* twice within an exquisitely structured smaller textual unit (Isa. 45:9-13),[68] which in its own turn is to be interpreted from the perspective of the preceding pericope. Given the prophecy in 45:1-7, the exiles wonder how Cyrus, a foreigner, can be Yahweh's anointed, a title reserved for Israelite kings within the OT tradition, and especially for those of the Davidic dynasty.[69] The answer comes in vv. 9-13: Israel has no right to criticize Yahweh's use of Cyrus as the instrument of his salvific activity. This divine decision demonstrates God's absolute sovereignty. God can choose whomever he wants to implement his plans, and needs to render no account of that choice. He is able to "command" the entire hosts of heaven (*wᵉḵol-ṣᵉḇā'ām ṣiwwêṯî,* Isa. 45:12; cf. 40:26); by contrast, no one can command him (45:11).

Here the basic meaning of *ṣiwwâ* and the peculiar nature of this verb emerge in the juxtaposition of subject and object in the fashion of master and subject. As the sovereign God, Yahweh can command all persons and things, but can be commanded by no one.[70]

2. Ps. 33:6-9 and 148:5 demonstrate the same theological conception from a different perspective than Isa. 45:11-12. Both psalms underscore the power of the divine word in formulations recalling Gen. 1. "By the word of God the heavens were made. . . . For he spoke, and it came to be; he commanded, and it stood firm"; "for he commanded and they were created."

The syntactic-stylistic construction here consists of the *qāṭal* + *w-yiqṭōl* of the verbs *'āmar* and *hāyâ* introduced by the personal pronoun *hû'* (with reference to Yahweh) and the parallel *qāṭal* of *ṣwh* + *w-yiqṭōl* of *'āmaḏ,* introduced by *hû'* (Yahweh) (33:9a par. 9b). In 148:5 the *qāṭal* of *ṣwh* is followed by *w-yiqṭōl* of *bārā'.* Ps. 148:5b and 33:9ab correspond formally: *kî hû' ṣiwwâ wᵉniḇrā'û* (148:5b), *kî hû' 'āmar wayyehî* (33:9a), *hû'-ṣiwwâ wayya'ᵃmōḏ* (33:9b). Within this syntactic and stylistic correlation, *ṣiwwâ* clearly refers to God's creative word (cf. also 147:15-18).

3. OT theological reflection frequently addresses the theme of creation within the context of history. In the book of Job God's sovereignty in creation results in his sovereignty in history. God's own questions to Job in 38:12 (cf. vv. 12-15) demonstrate that God alone has the power perpetually to renew the order of nature.[71] The same position is taken in the divine discourse in 36:27–37:21, which uses *ṣiwwâ* twice. Because Yahweh is able to command clouds and lightning, surely it is he who is behind such natural phenomena in the larger sense (cf. 36:32; 37:12). The cosmic elements are un-

68. See Naidoff, 180-85.
69. → משׁח *māšaḥ,* IX, 43ff.
70. See Stuhlmueller, 204-5; Leene, 314.
71. G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 503-4.

derstood as "God's host" ("God's regiment"[72]), which he rules as its highest commander. God's cosmic power is also reflected in the Song of the Unfruitful Vineyard (Isa. 5) and in Ps. 78, a wisdom portrayal of Israel's history. As the highest God (*'elyôn,* Ps. 78:17), Yahweh commands the skies (78:23). As the lord of the vineyard (Isa. 5:7), Yahweh *ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ* commands the clouds not to rain on the vineyard (v. 6). Such power to command demonstrates God's omnipotence (cf. Job 38:34).[73] Am. 9:3-4 similarly portrays God's cosmic omnipresence. Yahweh commands both the sea serpent and the sword as if they were personal beings (vv. 3,4). The serpent as the personification of the hostile power of the sea (cf. Isa. 27:1; Job 26:13) and the sword as the hostile power within battle are reduced to malleable instruments in the service of the divine command. Both in Amos and in the Isaianic Song of the Vineyard, the divine command acquires the character of chastisement or curse. By contrast, in Ps. 133:3 the object of *ṣiwwâ* is blessing. "To that place Yahweh extends the blessing. ברכה in the OT is the 'power of life,' 'enhancement of life,' 'elevation of life.'"[74]

4. Ps. 7:7(6); 44:5(4); 68:29(28); 71:3 all speak more about God's power within history than about his power over nature. The psalmist describes Yahweh as king (44:5[4]; cf. 7:7[6]) or as a rock or fortress (68:29[28]; 71:3); he guarantees victory, favor, and deliverance. In both 44:5(4) and 71:3, *ṣwh* is followed by the root *yš'*: *ṣawwēh yēšû'ôṯ ya'ᵃqōḇ* (44:5b); *ṣiwwîṯā lᵉhôšî'ēnî* (71:3aβ) in reference to the realization of deliverance. As king, God can decide or determine who will be the recipient of his deliverance.

In Ps. 71:3 *BHS* suggests following the LXX (as in 31:3) in reading *lᵉbêṯ mᵉṣûdôṯ*. Many scholars accept this emendation because the MT *lāḇô' tāmîḏ ṣiwwîṯā* makes no sense. A comparison with 44:5(4), however, encourages us to keep the expression *ṣwh* + *yš'*. Avoiding textual emendation, one can follow the suggestion of the TOB: "Be a rock where I can find refuge / where I have access every moment [NRSV 'to come continually']: / you decided [NRSV 'you have commanded'] to save me. / Yes, you are my rock, my fortress." Yahweh as the divine sovereign and strong rock need only issue the command *(ṣiwwâ),* and there is deliverance *(yš').*

The psalmist uses the same metaphors of God as savior *(yᵉšû'ôṯ)* and rock *(sela')* in expressing the conviction that God will surely be merciful (*ṣiwwâ ḥeseḏ,* 42:6,9-10[5,8-9]). Indeed, 42:6-10(5-9) expresses the same emotions as does 71:1-3: fear and apprehension are overcome by hope in God's deliverance, by trust in God's will; God needs only to command, and the supplicant will be delivered.

Hence the most diverse formulations associate God's power and sovereignty with his power to command. The creatures of the universe along with historical events all appear as the obedient instruments of the divine word, which commands and orders *(ṣiwwâ)* with a mighty voice.

---

72. G. Hölscher, *Das Buch Hiob. HAT* I/17 (²1952), 86-87.
73. See B. Duhm, *Das Buch Jesaia. HAT* 3/1 (1922), 56.
74. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150* (Eng. trans. 1989), 486.

V. 1. *LXX.* The LXX generally translates *ṣwh* with *entéllomai,* which occurs 350 times (344 for the piel, 6 for the pual), plus 3 times in Sirach (15:20; 45:3, piel; 7:31, pual). The verb *entéllomai,* whose basic meaning is "command, order," occurs another 50 times in the LXX as the translation for *'āmar, dibber,* and several other verbs. Its meaning and use are virtually equivalent with those of *ṣwh.*

Next in frequency are four verbs deriving from the root *tássō,* occurring altogether 117 times: 4 times *epitássō* (3 piel, once pual); 16 *prostássō;* 94 *syntássō* (92 piel, 2 pual); 3 *tássō.* In 2 Sam. 7:11 and 1 Ch. 17:10, *tássō* has the meaning "prescribe, decree" or "install." The same meaning accompanies the verbs *kathístēmi* in 2 Sam. 6:21, which translates *ṣwh* (cf. 1 Sam. 8:5, where it translates other terms) and *synístēmi* in Nu. 27:23. These passages involve the *nāgîḏ* formula or something similar in which *ṣwh* has taken on a specialized meaning. The same attempt at precise articulation is found in the use of *títhēmi* in Ps. 77(78):5 and *diatíthēmi* in Josh. 7:11, where *ṣwh* is dependent on the subst. *b^erîṯ.* The terms *apostéllō* and *eulogía* are used together in the same sense in Lev. 25:21 and Dt. 28:8 to render the expression *ṣiwwâ b^erāḵâ.*

The translation of *ṣwh* reveals the harmonizing tendency in the LXX especially in the context of fixed formulas. One particularly revealing example is the participial formulation *'^ašer 'ānōḵî m^eṣaww^eḵā,* which occurs in the MT in both singular and plural versions, with and without *hayyôm.* Here the LXX basically reads in the singular even where the MT reads the plural (cf. Dt. 11:13,22; 27:4; 28:14), also adding *hayyôm* where it does not occur in the MT (cf. 4:2b; 6:2; 11:22; 12:11,14; 13:1[12:32]). The same applies to the formula *ka'^ašer ṣiwwâ yhwh,* which in Numbers is generally complemented by *'eṯ mōšeh;* in Nu. 17:26(11), where the MT reads *'ōṯô,* the LXX translates *tṓ Mōysḗ.*

2. *Qumran.* The term *ṣwh* occurs 43 times in the Qumran writings (11 times in 1QS; 9 in 1Q22 [Words/Sayings of Moses]; 5 in 11QT; 3 in 1QH; once each in 1QSb; 1Q34 [Festival/Liturgical Prayers]; CD; 12 additional times in 4Q). Since battle and war are situations in which commands and orders are issued, one expects to find *ṣwh* in 1QM/4QM; peculiarly, however, it does not occur there at all.

Both the frequency and meaning of the verb in 1QS deserve special attention. One of the most basic ordinances of the community is the commandment: "to seek God *(liḏrōš 'ēl)* . . . as he commanded by the hand of Moses and all his servants the prophets" (1QS 1:1-3). In 8:15-16, almost at the end of the Community Rule, the author returns to this demand; although the expressions are the same, the meaning is slightly different. The ideal community of the future in the wilderness is to study the torah *(miḏraš hattôrâ),* "which God commanded by the hand of Moses."

The two texts concur in emphasizing the significance of the God-given law (cf. 1QS 6:6; CD 6:7; 20:6). Studying the torah is the same as seeking God. God's law contains his will as revealed through Moses and his prophets. As in the OT,[75] the formula *ṣwh b^eyaḏ* occurs frequently in Qumran (cf. 1QS 1:3; 8:15; 4QDibHam 4:8;

---

75. See II.2 above.

5:14). The equivalency between God's law and will, normally only implied in the OT, is made explicit in 1QS 9:15,24, which summons all to do God's will to please him (cf. 4QPhyl [131/132] II 6; *rāṣôn* is a term the MT never associates with *ṣwh*) as he commanded *(ka'ᵃšer ṣiwwâ)*. This basic precept of the Community Rule explains the significance ascribed to the divine will (cf. also 1QS 1:17; 5:1,8,22; 8:21; 9:25). The divine will is so sacred that there may be "straying neither to the right nor to the left and transgressing none of his words" (1QS 3:10). In the Words/Sayings of Moses (1Q22), the use of *ṣwh* is concentrated primarily in the first two columns, i.e., in God's discussion with Moses and, through him, with the Israelites. Both the form and the content of these sections distinctly recall certain texts in Deuteronomy on which they doubtless depend. Yahweh commands Moses to relay to the people all the words of the law he "commanded" on Mt. Sinai (1Q22:1,3,4; cf. 2:11). God warns the Israelites against violating the laws or being unfaithful to his precepts (1:6,9). The formulation in 1:8-9 is typical of the Dtn version.[76] Moses admonishes the Israelites not to become arrogant and not to forget what he has commanded them. The formulation here, *[hšmr] lmh yrwm [lb]bkh wšk[ḥth ']šr 'nwky [mṣw]k hywm* (2:4), has been inspired by Dt. 8:11a,14 with one important difference: what in Deuteronomy refers directly to Yahweh refers in 1Q22 to a commandment of Moses. 4QOrd (4Q159) 2-4:3 cites Lev. 25:42 (the prohibition against selling Israelites as slaves) and identifies it as a divine commandment.

Five passages in the Temple Scroll reproduce passages from Deuteronomy. These occurrences are concentrated in cols. 54-55 and 61-62 in connection with vows (54:6 par. Dt. 12:28; cf. Dt. 23:22-24[21-23]), prophets (54:17 par. Dt. 13:6[5]; 61:1 par. Dt. 18:20), agitators (55:13; par. Dt. 13:19[18]), and war (62:15 par. Dt. 20:17). One particularly striking feature in contrast to Deuteronomy is that the Temple Scroll basically speaks of God in the first person. Only in one instance, in connection with false prophets where Deuteronomy already has the first person, does the Temple Scroll repeat the Dtn text (cf. 11QT 61:1 par. Dt. 18:20).

García López

76. See III.2 above.

צום *ṣûm*; צוֹם *ṣôm*

Contents: I. Root. II. Meaning. III. Occurrences. IV. Word Field. V. Individual Passages. VI. LXX, Early Judaism, Qumran.

I. Root. Derivatives of *ṣm* in the Hebrew OT include the verb *ṣûm* (though only in the qal; 21 times) and the noun *ṣôm* (26 times; because it otherwise always appears without the article, some scholars also conjecture *bᵉṣôm* in Ps. 35:13; 69:11[Eng. 10]); it is also found in Aramaic (Elephantine),[1] Christian Palestinian Aramaic, Samaritan, Syriac, Arabic, Ethiopic, and allegedly also in Ugaritic[2] in an invocation against evil spirits.[3] In an inscription on a synagogue column in Rehob near Beth-shean, the name of one of the founders is allegedly *ṣwmy,* "he who was born on a fasting day" (?).[4]

II. Meaning. No semantic difference is discernible between the verb and noun (cf., e.g., Isa. 58:3-6, which uses both terms, or 2 S. 12:16; then Zech. 7:5 with 8:19; Ezr. 8:21,23). Alongside the passages from the Psalms mentioned above (Ps. 35:13; 69:11[10]), Est. 9:31 (addendum?) is also disputed.

Both the verb and the noun refer to "fasting" as a complete or partial abstinence from food and drink (cf. "neither ate bread nor drank water," Ex. 34:28; Dt. 26:14; 1 S. 1:8; Dnl. 10:2-3) generally for a period of a single day ("day of fasting"[5]), according to Est. 4:16 as long as three days from morning till sunset (cf. 1 S. 7:6; 2 S. 1:12; 3:35; Jgs. 20:26).

Such fasting can be a response to grief (1 S. 31:13; 2 S. 1:12; 3:35; 1 Ch. 10:12; Neh. 1:4: here too one experiences "mitigation" at the death of a fellow or in a particular situation[6]) or to existing or imminent distress, in which case the fasting might also accompany a confession of sin (1 S. 7:6; Neh. 9:1-2; Dnl. 9:3ff.; cf. Jer. 14:7,12; Jon. 3:4ff.) or prayers as a means of emphasis (Ezr. 8:21,23), functioning as a sign not only

---

ṣûm. A. Baumann, "Urrolle und Fasttage," *ZAW* 80 (1968) 350-73; R. Bohlen, *Der Fall Nabot. Tübinger theologische Studien* 35 (1978), esp. 161-62; H. A. Brongers, "Fasting in Israel in Biblical and Post-Biblical Times," *OTS* 20 (1977) 1-21; F. Buhl, "Fasten im AT," *RE,* V, 768-70; H.-J. Hermisson, *Sprache und Ritus im altisraelitischen Kult. WMANT* 19 (1965), esp. 76-84; E. Kutsch, *"Trauerbräuche" und "Selbstminderungsriten" im AT. ThS* 78 (1965), 23-42 = *Kleine Schriften zum AT. BZAW* 168 (1986), 78-95; H. Graf Reventlow, *Gebet im AT* (Stuttgart, 1986), esp. 201-2; F. Stolz, "צום *ṣûm* to fast," *TLOT,* II, 1066-67; P. Welten, *Geschichte und Geschichtsdarstellung in den Chronikbüchern. WMANT* 42 (1973), esp. 146, 171.

1. *DNSI,* II, 966.
2. J. C. de Moor, "An Incantation against Evil Spirits," *UF* 12 (1980) 429-32, esp. 431 (l. 7 of the text reproduced there).
3. *HAL,* III, 1012a.
4. Beyer, 675.
5. See IV below.
6. Kutsch, 34.

of mourning but also of penitence, or as an actual penitential rite (cf. 2 S. 12:16; Neh. 1:4; Jer. 14:12; Jon. 3:5). Fasting brings to symbolic expression the human disposition demanded by Yahweh,[7] and as a form of self-abasement and self-deprecation, i.e., as a sign of one's own lowly status (Kutsch), seeks to turn God from his wrath (cf. 2 S. 12:22). As such, it can also function as a preparation for other activity or other rituals (Ezr. 8:21; Est. 4:16; Dnl. 9:3), e.g., in preparation for receiving a revelation (albeit without *ṣûm*, Ex. 34:28; Dnl. 10:2ff.). Fasting is not attested in the OT as an atonement ritual. Jgs. 20:26 might refer to fasting in a Yahweh war (cf. 1 S. 14:24). Regarding the actual content of such fasting practices, cf. (in addition to the passages using *ṣûm/ṣôm*) also Isa. 22:12-14; Jer. 14:1–15:3(9); Jth. 4:1-15.[8]

III. Occurrences. The distribution of occurrences shows that only a few unequivocal or possible texts date to the preexilic period (Jgs. 20:26; 1 S. 31:13 par. 1 Ch. 10:12; 2 S. 1:12; 12:16,21-23; 1 K. 21:9,12[27?]). Except for Jer. 14, the preexilic prophets do not mention fasting; nor do even the older law collections (it appears first in Lev. 16). Nonetheless, these few texts do give the impression that the custom of fasting was already familiar, especially during ad hoc fasting days or on personal occasions. Following the exile, however, and especially during the postexilic period itself, the custom of fasting clearly appears more frequently and in a more organized form; indeed, its fixed association with other rituals shows that it became one of the more important expressions of faith.[9]

The verb occurs 21 times and only in the qal (Jgs. 20:26; 1 S. 7:6; 31:13 par. 1 Ch. 10:12; 2 S. 1:12; 12:16; 12:21,22,23; 1 K. 21:27; Ezr. 8:23; Neh. 1:4; Est. 4:16[bis]; Isa. 58:3,4[bis]; Jer. 14:12; Zech. 7:5[ter]). The noun occurs 26 times (2 S. 12:16; 1 K. 21:9,12; 2 Ch. 20:3; Ezr. 8:21; Neh. 9:1; Est. 4:3; 9:31; Ps. 35:13; 69:11[10]; 109:24; Isa. 58:3,5,6; Jer. 36:6,9; Dnl. 9:3; Joel 1:14; 2:12,15; Jon. 3:5; Zech. 8:19[5 times]).

IV. Word Field. Because fasting was part of both the private and the communal cultic expression of faith, it is generally mentioned in association with other rituals instead of merely as an isolated act (cf. the series in Est. 4:1-3). Not surprisingly, both the verb and the noun frequently appear in fixed expressions as well as with other verbs in both cultic and private contexts.

Because fasting was part of self-abasement rituals, functioning as a sign of despair, grief, and self-deprecation (cf. Isa. 58:3,5; Ps. 35:13; also in general 1 K. 21:27; Neh. 1:4; 9:1; Est. 9:31; Isa. 58:3-5),[10] it is often mentioned together with → אבל *'āḇal* (Neh. 1:4; Est. 4:3). Fasting includes weeping[11] (Jgs. 20:26; 2 S. 1:12; 12:15-22; Neh. 1:4; Est. 4:3; Ps. 69:11[10]; Joel 2:12). In such situations, people cry out to God[12] (Neh. 9:1-3;

7. Hermisson, 78.
8. Cf. also Reventlow, 251ff.
9. See IV below.
10. In this regard see Kutsch.
11. → בכה *bāḵâ (bākhāh)*, II, 116ff.
12. → זעק/צעק, *zā'aq/ṣā'aq*, IV, 112.

Est. 9:31), whom they also "seek" through fasting[13] (2 S. 12:16; Ezr. 8:23; cf. 2 Ch. 20:4; Dnl. 9:3). They lament and mourn[14] (2 S. 1:12; Est. 4:3; Joel 2:12; Zech. 7:5), cover their heads with ash or dust (e.g., Est. 4:3; Dnl. 9:3), and put on the → שׂק *śaq* as a penitential garment (1 K. 21:27; Neh. 9:1; Est. 4:1ff.; Ps. 35:13; 69:11-12[10-11]; Jon. 3:5; cf. 2 S. 3:31; 2 K. 19:1-2; Jer. 4:8, etc.; cf. by contrast Ps. 30:12[11]), pray,[15] and abase themselves[16] (cf. Lev. 16:29; 23:27; Nu. 29:7 on the Day of Atonement).

A special day of fasting[17] (Jgs. 20:26; Neh. 9:3; Isa. 58:3b,5b; Jer. 36:9; cf. also Zech. 8:19) can be "proclaimed"[18] (1 K. 21:9,12; 2 Ch. 20:3; Ezr. 8:21; Jer. 36:9; Jon. 3:5; cf. Isa. 58:5c), in which case the king seems to take the initiative (2 Ch. 20:3; also 1 K. 21:9; Jon. 3:5,7-9). H. W. Wolff has tried to reconstruct a "call to communal lamentation" based primarily on prophetic texts,[19] while Baumann has tried to understand what took place on such fasting days (on the basis esp. of Joel 1–2).[20] Jer. 36:6 and Neh. 9:1-3 (cf. Bar. 1:3ff.) suggest that such a day included a scriptural reading, a custom prompting Baumann to reconstruct the so-called original scroll of Jeremiah. Besides being "proclaimed," such a day of fasting was also "consecrated" or "sanctified"[21] (Joel 1:14; 2:15; both passages also mention the term *ʿaṣārâ*, "celebration, assembly"[22]). Joel 2:15 also suggests that this "proclaiming" or "consecrating" took place amid the sounding of trumpets.

More frequent or even regular communal laments with fasting as an essential component are attested especially both during and following the exile (Lam.; Zech. 7:5; 8:19).[23] Among the days of fasting mentioned in Zech. 8:19, only the ninth of Ab remained later as a regular ritual. Strikingly, the so-called lament of the people in the Psalter (as well as the book of Lamentations) nowhere directly mentions fasting. Are these texts silent concerning this accompanying or adjunct ritual because it was self-evident in any case, or are we imposing a premature systematization on cultic practices?

A glance at the history of religions at large and at the more immediate environs of ancient Israel in particular shows that fasting was by no means a specifically Israelite custom.[24] One cannot, however, demonstrate that fasting in Israel was merely a "remnant" of the Canaanite cult of the dead.[25]

---

13. → בקשׁ *biqqēš (biqqēsh),* II, 229ff.
14. → ספד *sāpad,* X, 299ff.
15. → פלל *pll;* cf. II above.
16. → ענה II *ʿānâ* II + נפשׁ *nepeš,* IX, 497ff.; see R. Martin-Achard, "ענה *ʿnh* II to be destitute," *TLOT,* II, 931-32.
17. → יום *yôm,* VI, 7ff.
18. → קרא *qārāʾ.*
19. H. W. Wolff, "Der Aufruf zur Volksklage," *ZAW* 76 (1964) 48-56 = *GSAT. ThB* 22 (²1973), 392-401; cf. idem, *Joel and Amos. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1977), 21-22.
20. Baumann, 359-61.
21. → קדשׁ *qdš.*
22. In this context → עצר *ʿṣr* is also of significance for the word field.
23. Cf. Reventlow, 201-2; H.-J. Kraus, *Theology of the Psalms* (Eng. trans. 1986), 121.
24. P. Gerlitz, *TRE,* XI, 42-45, with bibliog.; on Egypt and the "rituals of self-abasement" attested there, cf. H. Brunner, *LexÄg,* I, 1229-31; B. Schlichting, *LexÄg,* V, 1126-28.
25. So Stolz, 536.

Semantic antonyms to "fasting" include שׂמח *śmḥ*, → בשׂר *bśr*, and → גיל *gyl*.[26]

Criticism of fasting appears (apart from Jer. 14:12) only in postexilic texts (Isa. 58:1-12; Zech. 7:4-14; Joel 2:12-14, an admonition with Dtr influence), i.e., during a period when the custom of fasting was much more widely practiced.[27] The basic criticism is that one's demeanor toward God ("fasting") should be commensurate with one's demeanor toward one's fellow human beings, and that social action constitutes an expression of true fasting.

V. Individual Passages. Individual passages using the verb or noun present special problems or offer significant information.

In Jgs. 20:26 it is not clear whether the fasting (together with weeping and offerings) is a component of military activity in the war itself or merely a reaction to the defeat or perhaps even part of the ritual for obtaining an oracle.

After Saul and his sons are buried (1 S. 31:13 par. 1 Ch. 10:12; cf. 2 S. 1:12), the Jabeshites fast a full seven days. After David and Bathsheba's child dies, David ends (!) his fasting and weeping (2 S. 12:16,21-23), thereby arousing suspicion. His behavior is plausible, however, since his self-deprecation and penitence were occasioned by the child's illness rather than by mourning at its death. Ahab's fasting, rending of garments, and wearing of sackcloth is now (i.e., in 1 K. 21:27, and by extension in the addendum in vv. 27-29) to be understood in connection with Elijah's announcement of disaster (vv. 19-24).[28]

Isa. 58:3-5; Jer. 14:12; Zech. 7:5 all emphasize that such fasting does not automatically elicit a positive reaction in Yahweh.[29] Ps. 35:13 and Est. 4:16 show that one can also fast on behalf of others.

In 1 K. 21:9,12 (v. 12 as the implementation of v. 9), the noun is used within the chapter's Jezebel stratum.[30] Although the occasion for proclaiming a fast is not entirely clear (hardly the drought mentioned in 17:1), a cultic assembly is necessary in order to bring Naboth down, and indeed, the assembly is called together. Naboth himself is given the place of honor probably so that his downfall makes an even greater impression. This penitential disposition elicits the will to eliminate evil and to take action against the guilty, and as such it fits Jezebel's plan perfectly.[31] Moreover, the appearance of justice is also preserved.

According to Jon. 3:5, the king and inhabitants of Nineveh proclaimed a fast as a sign of penitence. Hence they were indeed already familiar with the custom and proved to be even more penitent than Jonah expected or even than Jonah himself.

The fasts in the fourth, fifth, seventh, and tenth month about which Zech. 8:19

---

26. Regarding antonyms to גיל *gyl*, → I, 473-74.
27. See Hermisson.
28. Concerning v. 4 and its motif, see Bohlen, 260ff.
29. Concerning the verbal suf. + dative meaning in Zechariah, see *GK*, §117x.
30. Bohlen, 350ff.
31. G. Fohrer, *Elia*. *ATANT* 53 (^{2}1968), 26.

speaks are now to become "cheerful festivals," "seasons of joy and gladness" for the house of Judah in view of the imminent period of salvation.[32]

Laments of the individual mentioning fasting include Ps. 35:13; 69:11(10); 109:24 (cf. also Est. 4:3). Ezr. 8:21 proclaims a fast before a significant journey, requesting that the journey proceed safely (cf. the verb in v. 23). 2 Ch. 20:3; Joel 2:15; and Jon. 3:5 all say something about the actual participants in such fasting insofar as their number is expanded, e.g., "throughout all Judah" or to include women and children.

VI. LXX, Early Judaism, Qumran. The LXX always translates the noun *ṣôm* as *nēsteía* and the verb *ṣûm* as *nēsteúein* (only in Est. 4:16 as *asiteín*).

Concerning the understanding of fasting during the late postexilic and rabbinic period and in Israel's Hellenistic-Greco-Roman surroundings, see, e.g., Sir. 34:26; 1 Mc. 3:17,47 (albeit in the Hebrew version of Sirach without *ṣûm/ṣôm*).[33]

The Qumran texts have not yet attested anything regarding the fasting of individuals, not even in the Temple Scroll. Only 1QpHab 11:8 refers indirectly to communal fasting on the Day of Atonement (cf. also CD 6:19) already familiar from Lev. 16:29ff. par.

Preuss†

---

32. Concerning the dates of these fasts, cf. W. Rudolph, *Haggai — Sacharja 1–8 — Sacharja 9–14 — Maleachi. KAT* XIII/4 (1976), 139-40; Wolff, *ZAW* 76 (1964) 49.

33. Also J. Behm, "νῆστις," *TDNT,* IV, 924-35; Brongers, 14ff.; B. Janowski, *Sühne als Heilsgeschehen. WMANT* 55 (1982), 138-39; K. Koch, *Daniel. BK* XXII (1980), 67-69; H. Mantel, *TRE,* XI, 45-48; idem, *TRE,* XI, 59-61, concerning the "fasting scroll"; St.-B, II, 241-44; IV/1, 77-114; R. Arbesmann, *RAC,* VIII, 447-524.

צוק I *ṣwq* I; צוֹק *ṣôq;* צוּקָה *ṣûqâ;* מָצוֹק *māṣôq;* מְצוּקָה *m^eṣûqâ*

Contents: I. Etymology. II. Occurrences, Meaning: 1. Verb; 2. Nouns: a. *ṣôq/ṣûqâ;* b. *māṣôq/m^eṣûqâ;* 3. Sirach. III. LXX. IV. Qumran.

I. Etymology. Occurrences of the root *ṣwq* in Akkadian with the meaning "be narrow, tight" (verb *siāqum/sâqu* with *s*![1] adj. *sīqu*[2]), refer to both physical/material things (body parts, clothes, a ship) and psychological conditions (stress, hard-pressed life, in-

---

1. *AHw,* II, 1039; *CAD,* XVI, 169-70.
2. *AHw,* II, 1049; *CAD,* XVI, 305.

sufficient time). In Ugaritic, *ṣq* means "be narrow," Š stem "press, seize" (see below). In the remaining Semitic languages, the term is in part specialized in a negative sense as "narrowness, stricture, pressure, distress," in connection with anxiety, disgust, pain, etc., including Middle Heb. *ṣwq*, "scare," hiphil "cramp, hinder," *ṣûq*, "chasm, abyss" (cf. 3Q15 8:8; 9:14), *'ûq*, "press, urge" (an Aramaism[3]); Jewish Aram. *ṣwq* peal and aphel, "be worried," *ṣûqᵉṯā'*, "hardship," Sam. *ṣwq* aphel, "feel disgust";[4] Syr. *'āq*, "feel disgust, be pressed" *ayayīq*, "narrow"; Christian Palestinian Aram. *'wq 'ap*, "be afraid," or *ṣwq*, "be depressed." The Arabic witnesses are semantically broader: *ḍāqa(i)*, "be narrow, apprehensive/depressed," *ḍayyiq*, "narrow, tight, slender," *ḍīq*, "narrowness, restriction."[5] In Old South Arabic the root is attested only in a placename, *mḍyq* and *mḍyqt*, "narrow valley."[6] Ethiopic attests *ṭōqa*, "be narrow";[7] cf. *'aṭaqa*, "press in on, restrict, oppress."

The three occurrences of the Ugar. root *ṣq(*s[w/y]q)* exhibit three different meanings. In one Anat grabs or seizes *(tšṣq)* Mot by *(b)* his garments.[8] The form semantically closest to Hebrew is *šṣq ly*, "[my enemies] pressed in on me."[9] The G stem of *ṣq* is attested without a preposition in *ṣq ṣdr*, "narrow of mind."[10] Scholars are undecided whether the form *mṣqt* is the pass. fem. ptcp. of *ṣwq* ("the distressed person") or of *yṣq* ("the anointed one");[11] this question cannot be decided here since the form is otherwise unattested in Ugaritic.[12]

Another root *ṣwq* is actually a secondary form of → יצק *yṣq*.

II. Occurrences, Meaning. The hiphil of the verb *ṣwq* I occurs 10 times in the OT; the hophal ptcp. *mûṣāq* occurs an additional 3 times (Isa. 8:23[Eng. 9:1]; Job 36:16; 37:10).

Neither Lisowsky nor Even-Shoshan adduces the form *ṣāqûn* (Isa. 26:16), which *HAL* identifies as a possible ("?") qal form (with *nun paragogicum*) of *ṣwq* I.[13] H. Wild-

---

3. *WTM*, IV, 180; III, 168-69.

4. See *HAL*, III, 1014a.

5. Lane, I/5, 1815-16.

6. ContiRossini, 227; cf. W. W. Müller, "Altsüdarabische Beiträge zum hebräischen Lexikon," *ZAW* 75 (1963) 313.

7. *LexLingAeth*, 1239; Leslau, *Contributions*, 44.

8. *KTU* 1.6 II 10; *ANET*, 140; cf. D. Pardee, "The Preposition in Ugaritic (Part I)," *UF* 7 (1975) 367; *CML²*, 76, 156.

9. *KTU* 2.33,27; cf. D. Pardee, "The Semitic Root *mrr* and the Etymology of Ugaritic *mr(r)//brk*," *UF* 10 (1978) 269; K. Aartun, *Die Partikeln des Ugaritischen. AOAT* 21/1 (1974), 70; 21/2 (1978), 45.

10. *KTU* 1.82,25; cf. J. C. de Moor and K. Spronk, "More on Demons in Ugarit," *UF* 16 (1984) 245.

11. *KTU* 2.72,18; cf. D. Pardee, "A New Ugaritic Letter (RS 34.124)," *BiOr* 34 (1977) 4, 10-11; contra G. J. Brooke, "The Textual, Formal and Historical Significance of Ugaritic Letter RS 34.124 (= *KTU* 2.72)," *UF* 11 (1979) 75-76; cf. *HAL*, III, 1014a.

12. See P. Xella, "Lexikographische Randbemerkungen," *UF* 12 (1980) 451.

13. *HAL*, III, 1014a. *BLe*, §56u, derives it from *ṣwq* II, "to pour"; *GK*, §72o, calls it an "anomaly" among the verbs *'ayin waw*.

berger's emendation (following Kaiser, et al.) to *ṣā'aqnû* seems most cogent.[14] The emendation of *n^eqiṣennâ* to *n^eṣiqennâ* in 7:6 is to be rejected.[15]

Substantives include *ṣôq* (only Dnl. 9:25), *ṣûqâ* (3 times), *māṣôq* (with *mem* preformative, 6 times), and *m^eṣûqâ* (7 times). Hebrew Sirach attests a hiphil/hophal ptcp. *ṣwqh* and *mṣwqh* once each.

Compared to the Akkadian, Ugaritic, and Arabic, the Heb. *ṣwq* and its derivatives have become semantically more specialized, meaning "drive into a corner, press in on, distress, badger" in the sense of a psychologically stressful and even terrifying condition generally brought about by external circumstances. The object of such pressing is attached with *l^e* except in Jgs. 14:17 and Job 32:18, where the accusative is used. Such objects can be individuals or an entire people. Similarly, the subject can be an individual or an actively hostile people, though also, especially in the Psalms, a fate brought on by sinful behavior. Parallels to *ṣwq* and its derivatives frequently include forms of the root → צרר I *ṣrr* I, "be pressed tightly together; be narrow, tight," understood both spatially (Isa. 28:20; 49:20) and psychologically.

1. *Verb*. The oracle of threat deriving from Isaiah himself in Isa. 29:1-8 uses *ṣwq* twice (vv. 2,7) to announce the military distress of Jerusalem caused by foreign nations, here semantically qualified by the parallel forms of → צבא *ṣāḇā'*, "engage in war," and → צוד *ṣwd*, "capture" (v. 7). This distress and pressure become concrete in a state of siege consisting of siege works, entrenchments, ditches (v. 3), and possibly even traversable ramps.[16] Such conditions force the inhabitants into a humiliating posture and evoke for them the realm of the dead (v. 4), though the possibility of rescue by Yahweh remains open (vv. 7ff.), probably recalling the miraculous rescue of Jerusalem from Sennacherib in 701 B.C.E. The severity and effects of such a state of siege come to clear expression in the announcement of the curse in Dt. 28:53,55,57 (late Dtr addendum[17]) and in Jer. 19:9 (Dtr). The situation is characterized by *b^emāṣôr ûḇ^emāṣôq ^ašer-yāṣîq l^eḵā 'ōyiḇ^eḵā* (Jer. 19:9 reads *yāṣîqû lāhem 'ōy^eḇêhem*), using the root *ṣwq* twice in connection with a form of *ṣrr* I to emphasize the seriousness of the situation, one driving the encircled inhabitants to the edge of existence, where they find themselves forced to eat their own children, an element appearing frequently in portrayals of besieged cities (cf. Lev. 26:29; 2 K. 6:29; Lam. 2:20; 4:10; Ezk. 5:10). This situation probably reflects that of 587 B.C.E. (cf. 2 K. 25:3-4). No escape is possible, since Yahweh's disobedient people precipitated the catastrophe in the first place (Dt. 28:47). Over against v. 52, which portrays the pure fact of siege (*ṣrr* I, hiphil), *ṣwq* here has the additional connotation, which in contrast to "besiege" *(ṣrr)* can be rendered as "cut into, cinch too tightly" (cf. the juxtaposed forms *māṣôr* and *māṣôq* in vv. 53,55,57).

---

14. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27* (Eng. trans. 1997), 555.

15. Following *BHS* and H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12* (Eng. trans. 1991), 284; contra G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Jesaja. ZBK* 19/1 (1960), 104; and F. Huber, *Jahwe, Juda und die anderen Völker beim Propheten Jesaja. BZAW* 137 (1976), 12 (still advocated by *BHK*).

16. *AncIsr*, 236-38.

17. See H. D. Preuss, *Deuteronomium. EdF* 164 (1982), 157.

imals, elicits anguish in those who visit it (cf. Dt. 8:14-15). According to Prov. 1:27, *ṣûqâ* brought about by sinful behavior is accompanied by distress *(ṣārâ),* panic *(paḥaḏ),* and calamity *('ēḏ),* and leads ineluctably to ruin even if people seek Yahweh's help.

b. *māṣôq/m^eṣûqâ.* The *māṣôq* brought about by hostile actions (Dt. 28) was described above. The mercenaries David gathers around himself after fleeing Saul include every *'îš māṣôq* (1 S. 22:2) alongside debtors and malcontents *(mar nepeš).* "These mercenaries were probably not particularly trustworthy people, but rather poor and of low status, economic failures and social misfits, obscure figures."[20] People can endure distress *(ṣar)* and *māṣôq* if they stay focused on God's commandments (Ps. 119:143).

In Zeph. 1:15 *m^eṣûqâ* exhibits a meaning similar to that of *ṣwq* and *māṣôq* in Dt. 28, here in reference to the fall of Jerusalem, which is identified with the day of Yahweh (v. 8) and intensified by allusions to wrath, ruin, desolation, gloom, clouds, and thick darkness. Similar to Prov. 1:27, in Job 15:24 distress *(ṣar)* and *m^eṣûqâ* are phenomena that suddenly befall the wicked *(rāšā')* and leave no means of escape. A gloss suggests that *ṣar* and *m^eṣûqâ* seize the person like a king waging war and thus lends a military coloring to the text.

The Psalms offer the most comprehensive examples of *m^eṣûqâ.* Those who have brought *m^eṣûqâ* upon themselves through their own culpable actions hope that God will bring them out of that condition and in so doing also broaden (*rḥb;* cf. Job 36:16 above) or alleviate the attendant troubles of their heart *(ṣar lēḇ)* (Ps. 25:17, postexilic). In the thanksgiving psalm 107 (postexilic), redemption *(g'l)* as liberation from distress *(ṣar)* becomes the polar opposite of *m^eṣûqâ.* The stereotypical formula "then they cried to Yahweh in their trouble *(ṣar),* and he delivered *(nṣl)* them from their distresses *(m^eṣûqôṯ)*" (vv. 6,13,19,28), functions as a kind of refrain summarizing what the rest of the verses describe more concretely as such distresses. The situation is characterized by constriction throughout a person's life, including lack of sustenance (with emotional reverberations, v. 5); sitting in darkness, misery, and irons (v. 10); wandering in the desert wastes (v. 4); the perpetual proximity of death as a result of sinful behavior (v. 18); and finally the end of all wisdom (v. 27). At the same time, however, remorse and repentance keep the door open for rescue by Yahweh.

3. *Sirach.* Sirach's use of the term does not deviate from OT use. The exhortation in 4:9 to "rescue the oppressed [*mwṣq* hophal ptcp.] from the oppressor [*mṣyq* hiphil ptcp.]" is semantically dependent on 1 S. 22:2 (see above) in pleading for just treatment of those in distress. In 37:4 the noun *ṣwqh* describes a universally human situation of distress in which a friend might demonstrate true friendship. If such a person withdraws, the alleged friendship was in fact based solely on material gain. God's mercy *(rṣwn)* makes a time of *mṣwqh* bearable or even pleasing, and is welcome "as clouds of rain in time of drought" (35:20).

---

20. H. Donner, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel und seiner Nachbarn in Grundzügen. ATD* Erg. 4/1 (1983), 190.

III. LXX. The many nuances exhibited by the use of *ṣwq* in the OT emerge in the wide variety of terms used in its LXX translation. Meanings range from "besiege" in the purely military sense to "press, assault" in the sense of "ruin, destroy." Renderings of *ṣwq* hiphil include *thlíbein/ekthlíbein* (Dt. 28:53,55,57; Jgs. 16:16; Isa. 29:2; 29:7; 51:13[bis]); *poliorkeín* (Jer. 19:9); *olékein* (Job 32:18); *parenochleín* (Jgs. 14:17). Renderings of *mûṣāq* include *stenochōría* (Isa. 8:23[9:1]), *katáchysis* (Job 36:16), then *māṣôq* and *m^eṣûqâ* with *thlípsis* (Dt. 28:53,55,57; Job 15:24), *anankē* (1 S. 22:2; Ps. 119:143; 107:6,13,19,28; Zeph. 1:15), and *poliorkía* (Jer. 19:9).

IV. Qumran. In the *Hodayot* the noun *ṣwqh* occurs 3 times, in two of which its use remains quite close to OT use. Alongside a general alienation from God caused by human insufficiency and perceived as a time of distress (1QH 9:13), mention is also made of evil friends who through their wicked behavior afflict the believer (5:33). The meaning of *ṣwqh* in 3:7 transcends OT use in comparing such distress with the situation of a woman giving birth (cf. 5:31; Jer. 13:21; 30:6, etc.). Use of the verb in 4QDibHam 5:18 corresponds to Isa. 51:13, while 4Q380 2:4 *(m^eṣûqôṯ)* cites Ps. 107:6,13,19,28 (see above).

Lamberty-Zielinski

צוק *ṣwq* II → יצק *yāṣaq*

צור *ṣûr;* מָצוֹר *māṣôr;* מְצוּרָה *m^eṣûrâ;* צוּרָה *ṣûrâ;* צִיר *ṣîr*

Contents: I. General Considerations. II. 1. The Verb *ṣûr* I; 2. The Nouns *māṣôr* I and *m^eṣûrâ* I. III. The Verb *ṣûr* II. IV. 1. The Verb *ṣûr* III; 2. The Noun *ṣûrâ;* 3. The Noun *ṣîr.* V. The Nouns *māṣôr* II and *m^eṣûrâ* II.

I. General Considerations. The verbs and nouns in this group can be classified according to three or even four different roots, all of which are secondary forms of other weak verbs. An exact distinction is difficult in many cases, and several passages are burdened by text-critical problems as well.

ṣûr. J. Hehn, "צור 'bilden,' 'formen' im AT," *Beiträge zur Religionsgeschichte und Archäologie Palästinas. FS E. Sellin* (Leipzig, 1927), 63-68.

II. 1. *The Verb ṣûr I.* The verb *ṣûr* I occurs exclusively in the qal.[1] It is a secondary form of → צרר I *ṣrr* I and has the basic meaning "bind, tie up." An example of this basic meaning appears in Ezk. 5:3, where the prophet is to bind a portion of his shorn hair and beard into the skirts of his robe, a gesture of safekeeping admittedly transcending the original symbolic act. Dt. 14:25 permits those who visit the central sanctuary to take along their tithe in the form of money that is "bound in hand," i.e., apparently in a pouch. 2 K. 5:23 makes this gesture explicit by adding the term *ḥārîṭ*, "bag." Because the same construction (albeit with the noun pointed differently) appears in the disputed verse Ex. 32:4, the reference is probably to the same procedure, namely, to binding up the gold in a bag.[2] The context does also allow one to interpret the procedure as a melting of the precious metal into molds,[3] in which case the verb would derive from *ṣûr* III. The parallel sentence construction in 2 K. 5:23 and Ex. 32:4, however, makes this interpretation improbable; moreover, *ḥereṭ* means not "mold" but rather "stylus" (Isa. 8:1), whence the reading *ḥārîṭ*. The same alternative "bind up" or "melt down" presents itself in 2 K. 12:11(Eng. 10), which does not qualify the verb more specifically. Although an ellipsis ("bag") may be present, a more likely explanation is simply a scribal error involving an original *wayᵉʼārû* (after 2 Ch. 24:11[4]).

From the meaning "bind/tie in," *ṣûr* comes to mean "enclose" and ultimately "besiege" as a technical term.[5] The verb thus appears frequently in siege accounts, either when the Israelites besiege one of their own (Tirzah in 1 K. 16:17) or foreign cities (Rabbath-ammon in 2 S. 11:1 par. 1 Ch. 20:1; Gibbethon in 1 K. 15:27), or when the residences of the two states, Samaria and Jerusalem, are themselves enclosed by foreign rulers (Ben-hadad, Shalmaneser, and esp. Nebuchadnezzar). The object can also be a person in the city who is being besieged, e.g., David in Keilah (1 S. 23:8), Sheba in Beth-maacah (2 S. 20:15), Ahaz in Jerusalem (2 K. 16:5). The war instructions in Dt. 20:10-20 stipulate how Israel is to conduct itself toward a besieged city (*ṣûr* in vv. 12,19; the noun in vv. 19-20).[6] The oracle concerning Babylon in Isa. 21:1-10, dating to before 539, exhorts Elam and Media (v. 2) to besiege Babylon (*ṣûr* used absolutely). By contrast, in the Ariel oracle in Isa. 29:3 Yahweh announces that he himself will impose the siege on Jerusalem. The root *ṣûr* is virtually a leitmotif permeating the symbolic acts in Ezk. 4:1–5:3 in which the prophet describes the siege of Jerusalem in 587. The verb appears in 4:3 (5:3), the noun in 4:2,3,7,8; 5:2, with a wordplay emerging between 5:2 and 5:3. Several passages use *ṣûr* figuratively. Isa. 59:19 compares Yahweh's advent to judgment with the power of a "pent-up" and thus "rushing"

---

1. On the one possible occurrence in the niphal (Isa. 1:8), → נצר *nāṣar* (VI), IX, 547.
2. M. Noth, "Zur Anfertigung des goldenen Kalbes," *VT* 9 (1959) 419-22.
3. C. C. Torrey, "The Foundry of the Second Temple at Jerusalem," *JBL* 55 (1936) 259-60; O. Eissfeldt, "Eine Einschmelzstelle am Tempel zu Jerusalem," *FuF* 13 (1937) 163-64 = *KlSchr*, II, 107-9.
4. Cf. *BHK*, in loc.; and J. Gray, *I & II Kings*. *OTL* (²1970), 584.
5. → סלל *sālal*.
6. See II.2 below.

The fem. noun *m^eṣûrâ* I is only weakly attested. Its plural is probably found in Isa. 29:3 with the meaning "siege mounds" (cf. the corresponding verb *ṣûr* at the beginning of the line). In Ps. 66:11 it should probably also be read for *m^eṣûḏâ* (cf. the par. *mû'āqâ*) with the general sense of "affliction."

III. The Verb *ṣûr* II. The verb *ṣûr* II, a secondary form of → צרר *ṣrr* II, is construed with the accusative of person and means "fight against, harass, press someone hard." It occurs only in the qal, specifically in three Dtr passages and one late text. In texts with almost identical wording (Dt. 2:9,19), Yahweh prohibits Moses from fighting against the Moabites and Ammonites while passing through Transjordan. The equivalent verse concerning the Edomites (v. 5) does not use the verb *ṣûr*. In Ex. 23:22, also Dtr, Yahweh promises to fight against Israel's enemies if Israel will but obey. This paronomastically structured sentence offers a fine example of how the forms *ṣûr* II and *ṣrr* II can be juxtaposed. Finally Est. 8:11 refers back to Haman's pogrom decree (3:13) but reverses it in that the Jews now receive royal permission to destroy those who assault them.

IV. 1. *The Verb ṣûr III.* Not all scholars agree on the existence of a verb *ṣûr* III as a secondary form of *yṣr*, "form, shape, fashion."[12] Only in Jer. 1:5 would this rendering be appropriate. Ex. 32:4; 1 K. 7:15; 2 K. 12:11(10) can be referring specifically only to the melting and casting of metal.

None of these occurrences, however, can unequivocally be derived from the alleged verb *ṣûr* III. 1 K. 7:15 tells how Hiram of Tyre cast the bronze pillars during the construction of the Solomonic temple. Although the procedure itself is clear enough, the integrity of the form *wayyāṣar* is highly questionable. Because the root *yṣq* occurs so often in this context as a technical term for the casting of metal (7:16,23,24,30,33, 46),[13] the unique form at the beginning of the verse is to be corrected to *wayyiṣṣōq*. Ex. 32:4 and 2 K. 12:11(10) probably also do not represent occurrences of the verb *ṣûr* III or its use in connection with metal casting.[14] Despite the unusual *plene* orthography, Jer. 1:5 is to be ascribed to the root *yṣr*.[15] Hence the existence of *ṣûr* III can at most be argued on the basis of noun derivatives.

2. *The Noun ṣûrâ.* The noun *ṣûrâ* occurs only in Ezk. 43:11. Here the prophet is told to describe the "form" of the future temple, its furnishings and gates, and finally also the applicable ordinances. Hence apart from the ordinances, the reference is to the "ground plan of the whole temple area."[16] The noun occurs a bit more frequently in the Qumran writings (1QM 5:5,8,14; 7:11), where it refers to the details of weapons or of priestly vestments, specifically to various types of adornment.

---

12. See esp. Hehn.
13. → יצק *yāṣaq* (II.3), VI, 256, with additional examples.
14. See II.1 above.
15. → יצר *yāṣar* (V.3), VI, 263.
16. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1983), 419.

cities in Judah (14:5[6]). The same probably also applies to the assertion that Jehoshaphat not only gave his sons many valuable gifts, but also fortified cities before their brother Jehoram murdered them (21:3-4).

Thiel

צוּר *ṣûr;* צֹר *ṣōr* I; צֹר *ṣōr* II

Contents: I. Etymology and Extrabiblical Occurrences: 1. Ugarit; 2. Hebrew and Aramaic; 3. *ṣōr* I/II; 4. Personal Names. II. OT: 1. Distribution of *ṣûr;* 2. Distribution of *ṣōr* I/II; 3. Word Field; 4. LXX. III. *ṣûr,* Rock: 1. Place- and Area Names; 2. Rocks. IV. Religious Contexts: 1. Theophany; 2. Sacrifice; 3. Religious and Cosmic Metaphor; 4. Deliverance in the Wilderness. V. Theological Metaphor: 1. Yahweh's Mount; 2. Divine Epithet; 3. Divine Name; 4. Mythical Progenitor(?). VI. 1. Sirach; 2. Qumran; 3. NT, Rabbis.

I. Etymology and Extrabiblical Occurrences. The word *ṣûr,* "rock, block of stone, rock face, etc.," is probably a primary noun seemingly unrelated etymologically to the verbal roots → צור *ṣwr* I-III. The word occurs only in the Northwest Semitic sphere, with the earliest occurrences probably in Amorite personal names and then in Phoenician-Punic personal names.[1]

ṣûr. H. Baltensweiler, "Fels," *BHHW,* I, 469-70; O. Betz, "Felsenmann und Felsengemeinde," *ZNW* 48 (1957) 49-77; G. Braulik, "Das Deuteronomium und die Geburt des Monotheismus," in E. Haag, ed., *Gott, der Einzige. QD* 104 (1985), 115-59, esp. 154-59; O. Cullmann, "πέτρα," *TDNT,* VI, 95-99; H. Donner, "Der Felsen und der Tempel," *ZDPV* 93 (1977) 1-11; H. J. Dreyer, "The Roots *qr, 'r, ġr* and *ṣ/ṭr* = 'Stone, Wall, City' etc.," *De fructu oris sui. FS A. van Selms. POS* 9 (1971) 17-25; D. Eichhorn, *Gott als Fels, Burg und Zuflucht: Eine Untersuchung zum Gebet des Mittlers in den Psalmen. EH* XXIII/4 (1972); H. W. Hertzberg, "Der heilige Fels und das AT," *Beiträge zur Traditionsgeschichte und Theologie des ATs* (Göttingen, 1962), 45-53; H.-J. Kraus, "Archäologische und topographische Probleme Jerusalems im Lichte der Psalmenexegese," *ZDPV* 75 (1959) 125-40; C. J. Labuschagne, *The Incomparability of Yahweh in the OT. POS* 5 (1966); S. Olofsson, "God Is My Rock: A Study of Translation Technique and Theological Exegesis in the Septuagint" (diss., Uppsala, 1988); A. Passoni Dell'Acqua, "La metafora biblica di Dio come rocca e la sua soppressione nelle antiche versioni," *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 91 (1977) 417-53; G. von Rad, "The City on the Hill," *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays* (Eng. trans. 1966), 232-42; H. Schmidt, *Der heilige Fels in Jerusalem: Eine archäologische und religionsgeschichtliche Studie* (Tübingen, 1933); A. Schwarzenbach, *Die geographische Terminologie im Hebräischen des ATs* (Leiden, 1954); N. A. van Uchelen, "Abraham als Felsen (Jes 51,1)," *ZAW* 80 (1968) 183-91; E. Vogt, "Vom Tempel zum Felsendom," *Bibl* 55 (1974) 23-64; A. Wiegand, "Der Gottesname צור und seine Deutung in dem Sinne Bildner oder Schöpfer in der alten jüdischen Literatur," *ZAW* 10 (1890) 85-96; H. Wildberger, "Gottesnamen und Gottesepitheta bei Jesaja," *Jahwe und sein Volk. ThB* 66 (1979), 219-48, esp. 244-45; A. S. van der Woude, "צור *ṣûr* rock," *TLOT,* II, 1067-71.

1. *APN,* 258; Benz, 202.

1. *Ugarit.* In Ugaritic the term *ǵr* occurs in the meaning "mountain,"[2] which with *ṣwr*[3] may derive from a common linguistic basis.[4] Dreyer thus not only suggests that the two morphemes derive from a common basis in Proto-Semitic, but also sees in the radical *?r* the basis for *gîr,* "pebble," *har,* "mountain," *qûr,* "hew stones," *qîr,* "wall," and *ʿîr,* "city."[5] Ugaritic associates *ǵr* with the notion of mountains from a cosmological and mythological perspective. When Baʿal raises his voice, it convulses the earth *(ʾrṣ),* hills *(gbʿ),* and *ǵrm.*[6] The inhabited world was understood as bordered by the two mountains *ǵr trʾzz* and *ǵr trmg,* beyond which began the realm of Mot.[7] There are also mountains in the underworld, e.g., the *ǵr knky,* which Baʿal must seek out after he has died.[8] On the way there, ʿAnat "wanders every mount to the heart of the earth, every hill to the earth's very bowels."[9] Otherwise *ǵr* refers to Mt. Zaphon,[10] the mount of El *(ǵr ll)* on which El resides and on which he will build a palace.[11] Mention is also made of the "Mount of Baʿal," similarly called "Zaphon" or "Zaphon's summit" *(mrym ṣpn).*[12] Building a palace there for Baʿal requires "mountains" of silver and "hills" of gold.[13] Finally, the cosmic dimensions of the lament for the sick King Keret become clear when even "the mount of Baʿal, Zaphon," weeps for him.[14]

2. *Hebrew and Aramaic.* The extrabiblical occurrence of this term in the Siloam inscription (ca. 700 B.C.E.) has generated a lively discussion. According to l. 3, the stonecutters working toward one another could hear voices even before the final breakthrough because there was a *zdh bṣr,* "a crevice (?) in the rock."[15] H. Michaud reads "excitement arose in the (interior) of the mountain," while H. J. Stoebe suggests there was a "meeting, coming together" of the stonecutters in the "mature rock."[16] The semantic nuance exhibited by *ṣûr* emerges in l. 6: "a hundred cubits was the height of the rock above the head of the stonecutters," a reading corresponding to a smaller tomb in-

---

2. *UT,* no. 1953; *WUS,* no. 2166; M. Dahood, *RSP,* I, 96, 125, 305-8; II, no. 49; see also *TO,* I, 158.

3. Concerning the sound shift, see W. von Soden, "Kleine Beiträge zum Ugaritischen und Hebräischen," *Hebräische Wortforschung. FS W. Baumgartner. SVT* 16 (1967), 291-94.

4. → הר *har,* III, 428-29.

5. Dreyer, 17.

6. *KTU* 1.4, VII, 32, 37; *ANET,* 135.

7. *KTU* 1.4, VIII, 2-3; *ANET,* 135 (Mount of Targhuzizza, Mount of Tharumegi).

8. *KTU* 1.5, V, 12; *ANET,* 139 (Mount of Kankaniya).

9. *KTU* 1.5, VI, 26; *ANET,* 139.

10. → צפון *ṣāpôn.*

11. *KTU* 1.2, I, 20; *ANET,* 130 (Mount of Lala); *KTU* 1.3, III, 29ff.; *ANET,* 134.

12. *KTU* 1.10, III, 11, 28-29; *KTU* 1.4, V, 23; *ANET,* 133.

13. *KTU* 1.4, V, 15, 31, 38; *ANET,* 133.

14. *KTU* 1.16, I, 6; *ANET,* 147; *KTU* II, 45; *ANET,* 148.

15. *KAI* 189; *ANET,* 321.

16. H. Michaud, "Un passage difficile dans l'inscription de Siloe," *VT* 8 (1958) 297-302; H. P. Müller, "Notizen zu althebräischen Inschriften I," *UF* 2 (1970) 234; H. J. Stoebe, "Zu VetTest 8, S. 297ff. (Henri Michaud)," *VT* 9 (1959) 99ff.

II. OT.

1. *Distribution of ṣûr.* In the Bible the term *ṣûr* occurs 74 times in Hebrew and twice in Aramaic (Dnl. 2:35,45). It is found most frequently in the Psalms (24 times), then Isaiah (12), the Dtr History (12), Deuteronomy (9), Job (6), Exodus (5), Jeremiah (2), and Nahum, Habakkuk, Proverbs, and the Chronicler's History (once each). The most concentrated text is Dt. 32 with 8 occurrences. Alongside 9 occurrences of the pl. *ṣûrîm* (collective or generic pl.), the pl. form *ṣûrôṯ* occurs but once as a designation for individual rocks (Job 28:10).[33]

2. *Distribution of ṣōr* I/II. The term *ṣōr* I occurs only 5 times in uncontested passages (Ex. 4:25; Josh. 5:2,3; Job 22:24 (contra *HAL*); Ezk. 3:9). Contested passages include Job 41:7(Eng. 15); Ps. 89:44(43); Isa. 5:28.

The term *ṣōr* II, "Tyre," occurs approximately 40 times. As a reference to the Phoenician island city (a peninsula since its conquest by Alexander the Great), it occurs primarily in Ezk. 26–29 (13 times), then also in the Dtr History (7), Isa. 23 (5), Chronicler's History (3), Jeremiah (3), Psalms (3), Amos, Micah, Joel, and Zechariah (once each).

Tyre was famous for its comprehensive trading network (cf. Hiram and Solomon, 1 K. 5:15-26[1-12]), though Jezebel also came from Tyre, the daughter of King Ethbaal, wife of Ahab, and a fanatical adherent of Melqart, municipal god of Tyre (1 K. 16). Her missionary zeal provoked the energetic opposition of the prophets (Elijah, 1 K. 18–19). Tyre ultimately became the model of the proud, arrogant city (Isa. 23; Ezk. 28). Amos 1:9-10 threatens it with destruction because of its war crimes against Israel. Isa. 23 probably alludes to some sort of punishment Esarhaddon carried out against Tyre, while Ezk. 26–28 threatens it with destruction by Nebuchadnezzar II, though this threat was ultimately probably reduced to an orderly surrender (cf. Ezk. 29:17-18). Under Alexander the Great, a huge causeway finally ended its island identity, and the city was taken (cf. Zech. 9:3-4).[34]

3. *Word Field.* The word field for *ṣûr* is quite broad and has been addressed in part by van der Woude. Virtual synonyms include → סלע *sela'*, "rock," with which *ṣûr* largely coincides both geographically and metaphorically, then *kēp̄*, "rock" (Aramaic loanword), *ḥallāmîš*, "pebble" (usually in connection or par. with *ṣûr*), and finally the most frequent and simultaneously semantically broadest term, → אבן *'eḇen ('ebhen)*. To the extent that *ṣûr* also refers not only to a kind of stone but also to a stone formation, other synonyms include → הר *har*, "mountain," and *giḇ'â*, "hill."

In metaphorical usage this synonymity is in part quite obvious, e.g., *maḥseh*, "refuge," *yᵉšû'â*, "help," and in part seemingly quite consciously construed. Because *ṣûr* does not enter into any frequent word combinations,[35] its few construct combinations do not offer much in the way of further insight.[36]

---

33. See Michel, 51-52.

34. Concerning Tyre, see H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27* (Eng. trans. 1997), 419-21; and H. Weippert, *BRL*², 349-50 (with bibliog.).

35. See Even-Shoshan, 982.

36. Concerning the word field in general, see Schwarzenbach, 113-23.

4. *LXX.* The LXX documents this fluid situation regarding synonyms especially well, since it renders only about half the occurrences with *pétra,* etc., sometimes paraphrases (*óros,* 3 times), or emphasizes only the protective function (*phýlax,* 4 times). In so doing, the LXX is reacting in a moderating fashion to the rather strong theological symbolism the "rock" had acquired in Hellenistic culture.[37] Passoni Dell'-Acqua has shown the growing hesitancy in the reception of this term in its theological-metaphorical application to Israel's God (cf., e.g., Qumran; see VI.2 below) prompting translators to render *ṣûr* with *theós* or *kýrios.* Symmachus prefers *krataiós,* Aquila *stereós,* and Theodotion *phýlax* (cf. Olofsson).

III. *ṣûr,* Rock. *Although ṣûr* does indeed refer to a rock, it does so in only a few instances in purely secular passages (in contrast to → אבן *'eḇen* [*'ebhen*], → סלע *sela'*).

1. *Place- and Area Names.* The term *ṣûr* occurs several times as part of place- or area names, even in apparently early traditions. Israel associated the *ṣûr 'ôrēḇ,* "Raven Rock," with their decisive clash with the Midianites (Jgs. 7:25; Isa. 10:26). David allegedly hid in the rocks on several occasions. Saul looked for him at the "Rocks of the Wild Goats" (1 S. 24:3). 1 Ch. 11:15 says that he was staying simply at the "rock" (*haṣṣur;* par. 2 S. 23:14 reads *m*ᵉ*ṣûḏâ*). Also during David's early period, the dispute between David and Ishbaal provided the etiology for the place *ḥelqaṯ haṣṣurîm,* "Field of Stone Knives" (2 S. 2:16), though this particular narrative rather suggests *ṣōr,* "pebbles, flint" (cf. Josh. 5:2-3), from which the knife used in circumcision was made.[38]

2. *Rocks.* At an apparently similar early period, mighty rock formations drew considerable attention in Israel. On the one hand, they functioned as excellent hiding places. Job 24:8 tells how the poor flee into the mountains from the greedy rich and must cling to rocks. The exposed locations of rock formations often made them excellent lookout posts. From the "top of the crags" the seer Balaam sees the people of Israel (Nu. 23:9). The city on the rock, Jerusalem, was considered to be especially secure (Jer. 21:13); cf. in this regard the strategically impregnable Nabatean city with the revealing name "Petra." Apparently honey (Ps. 81:17[16]), wine, and oil (Dt. 32:13) of exceptional quality could be produced among the rocks because of the inaccessibility. Finally, rocks were thought to conceal valuable treasures (cf. Job 28:10).

Rocks were viewed in general as the quintessence of stability and constancy. One particularly popular motif in wisdom literature is thus to associate God's omnipotence with the moving of rocks (e.g., Job 14:18; 18:4). The prophets of judgment also use this metaphor when they see God's wrath poured out like fire such that "rocks are broken in pieces" (Nah. 1:6).

---

37. See G. Bertram, "Der Sprachschatz der Septuaginta und der des hebräischen AT," *ZAW* 57 (1939) 101; Wiegand, passim.

38. → מול *mûl,* VIII, 158ff.

IV. Religious Contexts. Because rocks were viewed as places of special dignity, they appear in a wide variety of religious contexts.

1. *Theophany.* During the wilderness wanderings, Moses experiences a theophany in which Yahweh passes by him at a rock (Ex. 33:21-22). The same theophanic elements recur in 1 K. 19:11, albeit with reference to *har* and *sela'*.

2. *Sacrifice.* Although altar location and construction are generally associated with the term *'eḇen,* several early witnesses show that because of its open location, a *ṣûr* could also become a place of sacrifice. According to 2 S. 21:9, the Gibeonites executed seven of Saul's descendants *bāhār lipnê yhwh* (punishment of other members of a clan for the transgression of one of its members). Rizpah, the mother of two of the executed, kept watch on the rock (v. 10) until the corpses were interred. The rather complicated origin of the pericope can be seen in its incorporation of blood revenge, human sacrifice, and rain magic (Hertzberg) on the one hand, and the combination with motherly love on the other, and finally also its association with David's integration of the Canaanites.

According to Jgs. 6:21 (Gideon) and 13:19 (Manoah), a boulder could even serve as a regular altar.

3. *Religious and Cosmic Metaphor.* Metaphorical religious thinking symbolizes the unalterability of divine commandments by having them engraved in "stone" (Ex. 24:12; 31:18; Dt. 4:13).[39] Because such stone tablets had to be portable, authors consistently avoid the term *ṣûr.* By contrast, Job wishes that a permanent declaration of his innocence could be engraved on a rock "with an iron pen and with lead" forever (19:24).[40]

Such metaphorical thinking acquires cosmic features in wisdom and prophecy. In a graded numerical saying, the wisdom instructor enumerates four unfathomable things: "the way of an eagle in the sky, the way of a snake on a rock, the way of a ship on the high seas, and the way of a man with a girl" (Prov. 30:19). Job 28, a late chapter, reflects on where wisdom can be found. Although human beings "cut out channels in the rocks, and their eyes see every precious thing," they do not find wisdom (v. 10).

Already during the first stage of his proclamation, Isaiah announces the terrors of the "day of Yahweh"[41] before which the house of Jacob will try to hide in the "caves of the rocks" and the "holes of the ground" (Isa. 2:19). Exilic redactors pick up this oracle and emphatically associate it once more with idolatry (v. 20). The notion of "crawling under a rock" apparently became a fixed topos, since an early postexilic redactor also uses it to describe the collapse of human arrogance (v. 10).

Jer. 18:14 adduces the unshakable stability of the "crags of Siron" and the constancy of the "snow of Lebanon" to describe Israel's utter inability to repent[42] (Jer. 18:14; cf. 13:23).

---

39. → אבן *'eḇen ('ebhen),* I, 48ff.; → לוח *lûaḥ,* VII, 480ff.

40. See G. Fohrer's interesting reference to the Behistun (Bisitun) inscription, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 317.

41. → יום *yôm,* VI, 7ff.

42. → שׁוב *šûḇ.*

4. *Deliverance in the Wilderness.* With surprising frequency, *ṣûr* is used to designate rocks at which significant events took place during Israel's wilderness wanderings. If one takes Ex. 17:6 as the point of departure, all later passages are associated with one of the canons of deliverance miracles deriving from Priestly theology, canons that became increasingly fixed during the postexilic period.

According to the basic stratum (JE) of Ex. 17,[43] Yahweh tells Moses to strike the *ṣûr*, "and water will come out of it, so that the people may drink," in contrast to the later version in Nu. 20, where Moses is to command the *sela'* (an example of the theology of the word espoused by P) that it might yield its water (Nu. 20:8,10,11).[44] R^D recasts this miracle story into an account of a quarrel ("Meribah") between Moses and the people. During the postexilic period, R^P then belatedly reacts to this recasting by extolling Moses and simultaneously inserting mythological features into the text. The "rock" is no less than Horeb itself, where Yahweh is already present (v. 6a). Is this reaction perhaps an attempt to stylize Horeb into the familiar divine mountain of antiquity on which Yahweh now dwells?[45] The reflections of the events at Massah and Meribah are all younger literary pieces than Ex. 17 itself and reveal a tradition history with several different lines. On the one hand, Ps. 78:15; 105:41; and 114:8 develop this theme further in connection with a compendium of divine acts of deliverance; 78:15 even ascribes cosmic dimensions to the water miracle in that the *tᵉhōmôṯ* now fills the cosmos itself. On the other hand, this motif is also incorporated into prophetic literature (Isa. 48:21 juxtaposes it as a miracle of deliverance alongside the new exodus from exile). Finally, the late text of Dt. 8 incorporates this miracle into a retrospective on salvation history in which Yahweh made water flow from the "rock of the stone wall" (*miṣṣûr haḥallāmîš*, v. 15).[46] The reference in the Song of Moses to Yahweh's saving acts (giving his people the produce of the field, wine from the rock [*sela'*], and honey from the *ṣûr* [Dt. 32:13]) may also allude to Massah and Meribah. Job might also refer to this saving miracle when he describes his own previous joy as a time "when my steps were washed with milk, and the rock poured out for me streams of oil" (Job 29:6).

V. Theological Metaphor. The significant role *ṣûr* plays in the tradition of Yahweh's central acts of deliverance toward his people also influences the understanding of this term as a theological metaphor.

1. *Yahweh's Mount.* The most important rock after Horeb was doubtless Zion, though interestingly the preferred term here seems to have been *sela'* rather than *ṣûr*.[47]

---

43. On the literary ascription see E. Zenger, *Israel am Sinai: Analysen und Interpretationen zu Exodus 17–34* (Altenberge, ²1985), 56ff.

44. → סלע *sela'*, X, 272-73.

45. → צפון *ṣāpôn*.

46. See N. Lohfink, *"Ich bin Jahwe, dein Arzt" [Ex. 15,26]: Beispiele biblischen Redens von Gott*. *SBS* 100 (1981), 60-61; also F. García López, "Yahvé, fuente última de vida: Análisis de Dt 8," *Bibl* 62 (1981) 21-54.

47. Hertzberg, 48-49, discusses possible reasons.

The earliest witness seems to be the preexilic individual psalm of trust Ps. 27:5 and its allusion to the protective rock of Zion (cf. the other Zion terminology in the psalm, including → בית *bayiṯ;* → סכה *sukkâ;* → אהל *'ōhel*). In 61:3(2) the *ṣûr* is the saving place that the supplicant cannot reach alone, the protective precinct of the temple and the locus of God's presence. The background to this characterization of Zion may be the notion both of the mythical primal rock[48] and of the saving creator God.[49]

This same association of motifs recurs in Isaiah. Isa. 8:14 (authentic) speaks of Yahweh as a protective rock (cf. 26:4, "for in Yahweh you have an everlasting rock"[50]) even while reversing the metaphor for purposes of contrast (cf. Hab. 1:12). Isa. 17:10 (exilic redaction) probably identifies Zion with the "rock of refuge." The full confluence then appears in the late text 30:29: "You shall have . . . gladness of heart, as when one sets out to the sound of the flute to go to the mountain of Yahweh, to the Rock of Israel" (cf. LXX *prós theón*). The expression *ṣûr yiśrā'ēl* derives possibly from cultic piety, which the Isaianic tradition confronted with quite specific faith experiences. "Only when Israel realizes that Yahweh is not merely a God like all others, but rather the Holy One of Israel, will it acquire the right to trust completely in its confession that he is indeed its rock."[51]

2. *Divine Epithet.* The Psalms are particularly inclined to employ the metaphor of Yahweh as a rock and to develop it into a supplication motif. David's outcry, "Yahweh is my rock, my fortress, and my deliverer, my God, my rock in whom I take refuge, my shield, and the horn of my salvation, my stronghold" (Ps. 18:3[2] par. 2 S. 22:3), possibly authentic, was a popular topos well into the postexilic period particularly in the supplication of those who were unjustly persecuted and in connection with sanctuary asylum (see Ps. 31:3[2]; 62:3[2]; 71:3; 94:22; 144:1-2). The unshakable nature of the rock Yahweh becomes a metaphor for his righteousness and uprightness (73:26; 92:16[15]). One can trust in Yahweh; he is both rock and redeemer[52] (19:15[14]; 78:35), and is our portion forever.[53] He can also, however, turn against his people and become a rock they stumble over (Isa. 8:14). Regardless of whether, as is often suggested, the background to all these passages is actually Zion traditions (or traditions of salvation history[54]), it is nonetheless striking that they largely date to a later period, some even as late as the period during which Samaritan claims were being debated (Ps. 78).

3. *Divine Name.* The transition from *ṣûr* as an epithet to *ṣûr* as a divine name is fluid. In Ps. 28, a psalm dating perhaps to the early monarchy, the supplicant addresses

---

48. See IV.3 above.

49. See V.2 below.

50. Concerning the interesting rabbinic interpretation in Bab. *Menaḥ.* 29b, see Wiegand, 89-90.

51. Wildberger, "Gottesnamen," 245.

52. → גאל *gō'ēl,* II, 350ff.

53. On the hypothesis of hope in immortality in Ps. 73:26, see E. Jenni, "Das Wort *'ôlām* im AT," *ZAW* 65 (1953) 20.

54. As suggested by J. Jeremias, *Das Königtum Gottes in den Psalmen. FRLANT* 141 (1987), 107ff., for Ps. 95:1.

sents considerable interpretive difficulties: "Look to the *ṣûr* from which you were hewn *(ḥuṣṣaḇtem),* and to the opening of the well from which you were dug *(nuqqartem)*" (v. 1b par. v. 2a, "Look to Abraham your father and to Sarah who bore you").

Following P. Volz, many scholars understand this passage as an allusion to the ancient mythical notion of the birth of humankind from a rock and a well shaft.[61] Van Uchelen has tried to establish religio-historical support, though his results suffer from the lack of unequivocal witnesses.[62] The reference from Isa. 51:1 to Mt. 3:9 also leads nowhere. Finally, the parallelism between the two verse halves, despite reference to v. 3, does not make the interpretive reference to God any more cogent.

Because Isa. 51:1 MT cannot be interpreted satisfactorily, help may be found in the active notion rendered in the LXX reading: "Look to the *ṣûr* that you have hewn." P. A. H. de Boer adduces CD 6:9-10 in interpreting the "well diggers" as a reference to torah obedience and to a life characterized by fear of God, but at the same time overlooks the completely disparate terminology.[63] If, however, one considers the significant role played by *ṣûr* in theological metaphor[64] and Deutero-Isaiah's strong orientation toward Zion (cf. Isa. 40:9; 41:27; 46:13; 51:11,16; 52:7-8), one finds that here the prophet exhorts the exiles to think of Zion, which in its own turn was hewn into a vital city center (concerning the incorporation of → חצב *ḥāṣaḇ* into the work at Siloam, see also Sir. 48:17); of Abraham, their ancestor; and of Yahweh, who has compassion on Zion and its ruins (v. 3). The prophet is demanding nothing less than a renewal of the exiles' local, historical, and theological point of reference, albeit in rather enigmatic language.

VI. 1. *Sirach.* The 4 passages in Sirach that use *ṣûr* pick up on the late OT use of the term as a divine name (cf. the motif of supplication in Sir. 4:6). In the addendum to 51:12, "Give thanks to the rock of Isaac, for his mercy endures forever," this archaizing divine designation parallels in a singular fashion the "shield of Abraham" and the "mighty one of Jacob," and in this series replaces the older "Fear of Isaac" (Gen. 31:42).[65] Sir. 40:15, "the roots of the ungodly are on sheer rock," employs the motif of seed that has fallen on rocky ground (cf. Mt. 13:5; Mk. 4:5; Lk. 8:6). Finally, Sir. 48:17 praises the accomplishments of Hezekiah, who "tunneled the rock [of Siloam] with iron tools."[66]

2. *Qumran.* In the Qumran writings *ṣûr* has appeared but 3 times in passages consistent with OT usage. In the *Hodayot* the teacher knows that if he blesses his community, it will "run its roots deep into the hardest rock," i.e., will endure (1QH 8:23). Twice *ṣûr* is used as a divine epithet (1QH 11:15; cf. Ps. 18:47[46]), and the unique formulation appears in 4QDibHam^a 5:19, "for we have also tired God with our iniquity, we have wearied (*'āḇaḏ* hiphil) the Rock with our sins" (cf. Isa. 43:23-24). The Qumran community

---

61. → חצב *ḥāṣaḇ,* V, 127.
62. Van Uchelen, 188.
63. P. A. H. de Boer, "Second Isaiah's Message," *OTS* 11 (1956) 58-67.
64. See V.1-3 above.
65. → פחד *pāḥaḏ.*
66. See V.4 above.

Cant. 5:10 apparently uses *ṣaḥ* adjectivally alongside *'āḏôm* ("my beloved is all white and red"). In Isa. 18:4 *(keḥōm ṣaḥ)* and Jer. 4:11 *(rûaḥ ṣaḥ),* the term *ṣaḥ* can be understood as an adjective, "shimmering, flickering,"[7] or as a substantive in the construct state;[8] similarly also *leḏabbēr ṣaḥôṯ* in Isa. 32:4 (see above).

As a substantive, *ṣḥḥ* appears in the expression *ṣeḥîaḥ sela'* (only in Ezk. 24:7-8; 26:4,14; LXX *leōpetría*) and in the hapax legomenon *ṣeḥîḥâ,* "barren, burned-out land" (Ps. 68:7[Eng. 6]). The LXX renders *baṣṣeḥîḥîm* (Neh. 4:7) as *en toís skepeinoís,* "at the covered places," perhaps reflecting the reading *baṣṣerîḥîm,* "towers/fortresses" (cf. Jgs. 9:46,49), though following Ezk. 24:7, etc., it could also mean "at the free, open places."[9]

II. Use. In addition to the etymologically deduced meanings "warm/hot," "bright/white," "arid/dry," several scholars also find in *ṣaḥ* the name of one of the ancient Hebrew-Canaanite months. This interpretation is based on an inscribed jar stamp discovered in Arad (7th century B.C.E.). According to Aharoni, the text reads: *bšlšt,* "in the third year," *yrḥ ṣḥ,* "(in the) month of Ṣaḥ." Several scholars have questioned the reading of the second line (Naveh, Teixidor, Weippert), while Lemaire discards it outright and instead reads the patronym *gr' bn 'zyhw,* which Aharoni in his own turn has rejected.[10] Koffmahn then incorporated this rediscovered biblical month[11] into a reconstructed list of ancient Israelite and Canaanite-Phoenician months,[12] and Soggin used the term as the basis for a reinterpretation of *ṣaḥ* in Isa. 18:4 and Jer. 4:11.[13]

The brief passage Isa. 18:4-6 differs in both language and style from the surrounding material and is also set off structurally from that context in the manner of a ring composition by the repetition of v. 2b in v. 7. It is a prophetic saying in which God's "collected calm" (Wildberger, Kaiser) is metaphorically equated with the fixed, peaceful course of the agricultural year. The nouns used here, *qāṣîr* and *mazmērôṯ* (reference to *zāmîr*), and the verb *qāṣ* (deriving from *qayiṣ*) all allude to seasons that in the Gezer Calendar are listed in the same sequence and with the additional qualification *yrḥ,* "month," *yrḥ qṣr, yrḥw zmr, yrḥ qṣ,* which together constitute the first three out of four periods within an annual calendar commencing at the end of the period of rains. Two of these designations, *qāṣîr* and *qayiṣ,* also appear in Gen. 8:22, in 1 En. 82:17, and in a list of annual subdivisions or festivals from Qumran.[14] In these sources *zera'* (cf. Gezer Calendar: *yrḥw zr'*) replaces the allusion to *zāmîr (mazmērôṯ)* in Isa. 18:5. The fourth season, called *dš'* in the text from Qumran (similarly in 1 Enoch) but *ḥōrep* in Gen. 8:22, is alluded to in Isa. 18:6 by the verb *teḥerap.* Altogether, the text of Isaiah as well

7. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27,* in loc.
8. W. Rudolph, *Jeremia. HAT* I/12 (³1968), 30.
9. See W. Rudolph, *Esra und Nehemia. HAT* I/20 (1949), 126.
10. Aharoni, *Arad Inscriptions,* 40-41.
11. Koffmahn, 209-11, 217.
12. Cf. *TSSI,* I, 51: "doubtless the ancient name of the month."
13. Equally O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 13–39. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1974), 89-90, 95.
14. Talmon, *King, Cult, and Calendar,* 101ff.

as the Qumran document reflects the list of the annual seasons in Genesis, albeit in a different sequence:

Isa. 18:4-6	Gen. 8:22	Qumran
qāṣîr	*qāṣîr*	*qṣyr*
mazmērôṯ (zāmîr)	*zeraʿ*	*zrʿ*
qāṣ (qayiṣ)	*qayiṣ*	*qyṣ*
teḥᵉrap (ḥōrep̱)	*ḥōrep̱*	*dšʾ*

The agricultural and calendrical structure of the Isaianic passage emerges even more clearly in the allusions to the grass crop in the late rainy period (*ʾwr,* v. 4; cf. 2 K. 4:39; Isa. 26:19, comparable to *dšʾ* in Qumran), to the ears of corn prior to the grain harvest mentioned as the first season *(lipnê qāṣîr),* and to the state of the grapes before the harvest *(zāmîr),* "when the blossom is over and the flower becomes a ripening grape" (v. 5; cf. Gen. 40:10; Nu. 17:23[8]; Job 15:33), before the vines are cut off with pruning hooks.

The structure of this passage in Isaiah recalls the sequence of visions in Amos that presumably similarly follows the course of the agricultural year beginning with the late rainy period. The expressions *leqeš, ʿēśeḇ hāʾāreṣ* (Am. 7:1-2), "mowing (of the grass)," correspond to *dšʾ* (Qumran), *ḥōrep* (Gen. 8:22), and *teḥᵉrap* (Isa. 18:6). Reference to the summer heat brought about by God (*qōrēʾ lārîḇ bāʾēš . . . wᵉʾāḵᵉlâ ʾeṯ-haḥeleq,* Am. 7:4) corresponds to *ḥōm ṣaḥ* (Isa. 18:4) and perhaps to *rûaḥ ṣaḥ* in Jer. 4:11. Finally, the "basket (full) of summer fruit" (*kᵉlûḇ qayiṣ,* Am. 8:1) stands for *qāṣ* in Isa. 18:6 as an allusion to the time of the fruit harvest, *qayiṣ,* which the other sources mention explicitly.[15]

Even if the use of *ṣaḥ* as the name of a month cannot be demonstrated with complete certainty, this suggestion nonetheless contributes to a better understanding of Isa. 18:4-6 and perhaps also of Jer. 4:11.

Talmon

15. Talmon, *Tarbiz* 35 (1965-66) 301-3; *idem,* "Prophetic Rhetoric and Agricultural Metaphora," in *Storia e Tradition: d'Israele. Festschrift J. A. Soggin* (Rome, 1991), 267-790.

צָחַק *ṣāḥaq* → שׂחק *śāḥaq*

צִי *ṣî;* צִיִּים *ṣîyîm*

Contents: I. Etymologies and Isoglosses: 1. *ṣî* I, "Ship"; 2. *ṣî II, "Desert Creatures." II. The Meaning of *ṣî* I. III. The Meaning of *ṣî II: 1. Oracles of Disaster; 2. Other Passages. IV. Qumran.

I. Etymology and Isoglosses. Lexicons generally derive two homonyms from *ṣî:* (1) *ṣî* I, "ship," an Egyptian loanword from *ḏꜣy* and similar constructions,[1] and (2) *ṣî II < *ṣîyî (attested only in the pl.), a collective designation for "desert creatures" with partly demonic features. In the latter case, the term represents a *nisbe* or derived form either from the fem. noun *ṣîyâ,* which as an adjectival attribute to *'ereṣ,* "land," means "dry" and as a substantive "arid landscape" (similarly *ṣāyôn* in Isa. 25:5; 32:2), or from an otherwise unknown masc. version of *ṣîyâ.*

1. *ṣî I, "Ship."* No insurmountable phonological considerations militate against the assumption that Egyp. *ḏꜣy* was adopted as Heb. *ṣî* I. The exchange of *ḏ* and *ṣ* occurs relatively frequently in both directions.[2] The apparently late Egyp. *nomen agentis ḏꜣyw* > *ḏꜣy,* "(a kind of) river ship,"[3] derives from *ḏꜣy,* "ferry across a river" (from the time of the Pyramid Texts),[4] and was incorporated into Demotic as *ḏy,* "ship,"[5] and into Coptic as *žoi,* "ship, boat."[6]

W. W. Müller assumed the presence of a Minaean lexeme *ṣy, "merchant ship," as

---

ṣî. M. Ellenbogen, *Foreign Words in the OT* (London, 1962), 145; T. O. Lambdin, "Egyptian Loanwords in the OT," *JAOS* 73 (1953) 145-55, esp. 153-54; E. Strömberg Krantz, *Des Schiffes Weg mitten im Meer: Beiträge zur Erforschung der nautischen Terminologie des ATs. CBOT* 19 (1982), 66-69.

1. See Ellenbogen.
2. Concerning *šáꜣy* > /ṭ/, see Lambdin.
3. *WbÄS,* V, 515.
4. E. Edel, *Altägyptische Grammatik,* I (Rome, 1955), §227; W. Osing, *Die Nominalbildung im Ägyptischen* (Mainz/Rhein, 1976), 171 with n. 769, 173-74, nn. 790-91.
5. W. Erichsen, *Demotisches Glossar* (Copenhagen, 1954), 674.
6. W. E. Crum, *Coptic Dictionary* (1939, repr. Oxford, 1962), 754; W. Westendorf, *Koptisches Handwörterbuch* (Heidelberg, 1965-77), 415, also 571, where derivation *from* the Hebrew is considered (personal communication from M. Görg); cf. also J. Černý, *Coptic Etymological Dictionary* (Cambridge, 1976), 310; Vycichl, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue copte* (Leuven, 1983), 324.

an Egyptian foreign word in l. 2 of the sarcophagus inscription of Gizeh (*RES* 3427), though such is disputed.[7]

2. **ṣî II, "Desert Creatures."* Following S. Bochart,[8] scholars have been inclined to assume the presence of an Arabic isogloss *ḍaywan,* "wildcat," *ḍuyain,* etc., "small wildcat."[9] Since the afformative morpheme *-ān* must be excluded for orthographical reasons and because of the broken plural *ḍayāwin, -n* must be part of the root, and its disappearance in Hebrew would have to be explained.

II. The Meaning of *ṣî* I. Isa. 33:21 is definitely using Heb. *ṣî* I in the singular parallel with →*nî,* "ship(s)"; only here does the LXX also translate with *ploíon.* The plural form appears in the spellings *ṣyym* in Dnl. 11:30 and *ṣym* in Nu. 24:24 and Ezk. 30:9; in all four passages the Vulg. uses forms of *trieris.*[10] Although *ṣyym,* "ships/boatmen," may be attested in Isa. 23:13,[11] most interpreters understand the term as **ṣî* II.

In Isa. 60:9 the reading *ṣîyîm,* "ships/boatmen," is preferable to *ʾîyîm,* "islands," because of the par. *wā*→*nîyôṯ,* "ships."[12] The error from *ṣyym* to *'yym* may have resulted from the appearance of *ṣîyîm,* "desert creatures," from **ṣî* II in Isa. 13:21-22; 34:13-14; Jer. 50:39, together with *ʾîyîm,* "jackals" or "island goblins,"[13] in which case homonyms were confused. Ps. 72:9-10 similarly associates *ṣîyîm,* "desert creatures," and *ʾîyîm,* "islands."

All these occurrences are postexilic if not late postexilic, exhibit features of glosses, and are found in uncertain readings. In every instance this unusual sounding and somewhat affected lexeme is used in an eschatological context.

If the conjecture in Isa. 60:9 is correct, it probably represents the earliest occurrence of *ṣîyîm,* "ships." Here *ṣîyîm* together with →*nîyôṯ taršîš bāriʾšōnâ,* "the ships of Tarshish first," will gather at the end of the age to transport the Jewish diaspora with all its acquired foreign wealth back to Jerusalem, thus simultaneously extolling Yahweh and glorifying Israel.

Instead of the Masoretic *yᵉqawwû,* "they wait, hope," which, if one presupposes a corruption to *ʾîyîm,* "islands," is imitating Isa. 51:5, one should consider the context here, namely, 60:8,9aβ, and the synonymous *yiqqāḇᵉṣû,* "they gather" (v. 7), and vocalize *yiqqāwû.*

---

7. W. W. Müller, "Altsüdarabische Beiträge zum hebräischen Lexikon," *ZAW* 75 (1963), 313; cf. ContiRossini, 223.

8. *Hierozoïcon sive . . . de animalibus S. Scripturae,* I (Leiden/Utrecht, 1675), book 3, ch. 14 (861-65).

9. In this regard see A. Wahrmund, *Handwörterbuch der neuarabischen und deutschen Sprache,* I/2 (Giessen, ³1898), 114.

10. Concerning the other versions, see Ellenbogen.

11. B. Duhm, *Das Buch Jesaja. HAT* III/1 (²1902), in loc.; K. Marti, *Das Buch Jesaia. KHC* X (1900), in loc.; O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 13–39. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1974), 161 n. h; H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27* (Eng. trans. 1997), 405, 410.

12. Duhm, *Jesaja,* 449; C. Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1969), 354.

13. See III below.

The introductory formula *bayyôm hahû'*, "on that day," shows that Ezk. 30:9 is an addendum that expands the oracle of disaster against Egypt (itself an anomaly among comparable sayings in Ezekiel) to include *kûš*, Ethiopia or northern Sudan. Messengers of terror are suddenly dispatched there *bṣym*, "in ships" (Vulg.: *in trieribus*). One might read *'āṣîm*, "pressing urgently," following *speúdontes* (LXX), *festinantes* (Jerome's Symmachus), and *msrhb'yt* (Syr.) (cf. Theodotion *sub ast.:* the transliteration *essim;* Aquila *sub ast.: etieim;* also Jerome's version of Aquila and Theodotion: *siim*). Otherwise *bṣym* here probably reflects both the meaning of the original word *ḏꜣy* and (similarly also Isa. 18:2, albeit with different terminology) its military connotation.

If one follows Kaiser in understanding Isa. 33:21 as an oracle of salvation that, like Ezk. 47 and Joel 4:18(Eng. 3:18), portrays a miraculous river flowing out from Jerusalem,[14] then one must delete *yᵉ'ōrîm*, "Nile," and understand both *ᵒnî šayiṯ*, "galley/ies with oars," and *ṣî 'addîr*, "stately ship(s)," as warships that are being excluded from this eschatological scene. If by contrast one still reads *yᵉ'ōrîm*, then this reference to a Nile void of any water traffic can only represent a gloss (Isa. 33:21aβ-b) whose intent is to juxtapose salvation for Zion (vv. 17-21aα,22,24) with disaster for Egypt.[15]

According to Dnl. 11:30, *ṣîyîm kittîm*, "ships of Kittim," will advance against Antiochus IV Epiphanes, "and he shall lose heart and withdraw." Here *kittîm* (LXX *rhōmaíoi*) apparently alludes to the Roman envoy C. Popilius Laenas, who after Rome's victory over the Macedonian state at Pydna brought an end to Antiochus's second Egyptian campaign in 168, for which the latter then again took advantage of the Jews. The similar but textually uncertain *vaticinium ex eventu* Nu. 24:24 refers to the same event. The humiliation that the *ṣîm mîyaḏ kittîm* will bring upon *'aššûr*, i.e., Antiochus, on the one hand, and upon *'ēḇer*, i.e., upon the Jews he persecutes, on the other, will cause his (Antiochus's?) downfall. Both the Vulg. *(de Italia)* and Tg. Onq. *(m[n]rwm'y*, "from the Romans") interpret the historical background correctly.

Isa. 23:13 doubtless represents a gloss on v. 12. Even though the beginning of v. 13 has apparently been influenced by *'aššûr* in v. 13aβ in reading *'ereṣ kaśdîm*, "land of the Chaldeans," a preferable reading, commensurate with *kitt(îy)îm* in v. 12bα, is *'ereṣ kittîyîm*. Particularly if *lᵉṣîyîm* is to be understood as *ṣî* I, then *'aššûr yᵉsāḏâ lᵉṣîyîm*, "Assyria founded/destined it [i.e., the land of the Kittim] for ships," may well represent a cloaked allusion, based on a misunderstanding or a reinterpretation, to (Dnl. 11:30 and) Nu. 24:24, since all three key words in Nu. 24:24 *(kitt[îy]îm, 'aššûr, ṣîm)* recur in Isa. 23:12-13.

III. *The Meaning of *ṣî* II. It is of significance for determining the meaning of *ṣî II < *ṣîyî that the lexeme appears (1) in Isa. 13:21; 34:14; Jer. 50:39 together with other animal names in colorful oracles of disaster (cf. also Isa. 23:13), and (2) in Ps. 72:9 and 74:14 among the king's enemies or other powers of chaos.

---

14. Kaiser, *Isaiah 13–39*, 348-49.

15. H. Wildberger, *Jesaja 28–39*. *BK* X/3 (1982), 1309, 1311, 1320. On the semantic shift from Egyp. *ḏꜣy*, "riverboat, ship," to the Heb. lexeme *ṣî* I with its military connotations, see Strömberg Krantz, 66-67.

here is not to the eschaton and the messiah, but to the (actual) accession of the Davidides. Those who in various ways must humble themselves before the king include not only the *ṣîyîm* (v. 9a), but also "his enemies" (v. 9b), the "kings of Tarshish," "isles," the legendary kings of southern Arabia (v. 10), indeed, "all kings" and "all nations." Hence if one does not take a cue from the par. *'ôyᵉḇāyw* in reading rather *ṣārîm*, "the foes," or something similar (cf. *BHS*, et al.), *ṣîyîm* might be understood following the LXX, Aquila, Symmachus *(Aithíopes)*, and Vulg. *(Aethiopes)* as a reference to the human inhabitants of the steppe regions, which given the derivation of **ṣî* II as a *nisbe* from *ṣîyâ* or something similar is not as improbable as *GesB* suggests.

By contrast, if in Ps. 74:14 one reads *lᵉʿam ṣîyîm* instead of the impossible MT *lᵉʿām lᵉṣîyîm* and follows Vulg. *(populo Aethiopum)*,[20] the passage asserts that the *ʿam ṣîyîm*, "the people of the wilderness creatures," receive the dead body of *liwyāṯān* as food (v. 14a). Here, then, creatures of the wilderness are antithetically juxtaposed with those of the sea.

Although the conjecture suggested by I. Löw, *lᵉʿamlᵉṣē yām*, "the smooth/slippery ones [i.e., sharks] of the sea)," does preserve the consonants in Ps. 74:14bβ, it is still to be rejected.[21] Neither witnesses nor isoglosses can be adduced for **ʿamlāṣ*. One semantic consideration militating against a connection with Arab. *ʾamlaṣ*, "smooth, slippery," is that such would apply only to small fish that slip out of the fisher's hands, something hardly applicable even to the mackerel shark. Moreover, despite L. Köhler's discussion, the assumption of an *ʿayin prostheticum* remains problematic.[22]

IV. Qumran. The term *ṣîyîm* can be reconstructed in 4QShir^a (510) 1:5 (par. 4QShir^b [511] 10:2) only following Isa. 13:21; 34:14.[23] By contrast, 4QWiles (184) 3:4 genuinely attests the sg. *ṣy*, albeit in a text too fragmentary to yield a satisfactory interpretation.

H.-P. Müller

---

20. Also H. Gunkel, *Die Psalmen*. *HKAT* II/2 (^{5}1968), 325.

21. First suggested by F. Perles, "Biblische Fauna und Flora," *MGWJ* 68 (1924) 160-61; most recently *HAL*, II, 845b.

22. L. Köhler, "Vom hebräischen Lexikon," *OTS* 8 (1950) 150-51; cf. *CPT*, 236-37.

23. See M. Baillet, *DJD*, VII, 216, with the translation "wildcats."

one should read *ṣîyâ*.[11] Seybold's suggestion seems most cogent according to which *ṣîyôn* represents the remnant of an earlier redaction of a basic text that contained a different word,[12] albeit a word that can no longer be reconstructed.[13] Seybold's conjecture *'îyôn* actually goes back to Jirku and is supported (over against an emendation to *ṣîyâ*) by the closer consonantal similarity, the geographical plausibility, as well as by the mention of Hermon in the first hemistich, which leads one to expect the mention of a corresponding concrete geographical place.[14]

Alongside *ṣîyâ*, the subst. *ṣāyôn* also occurs twice, as does the word *ṣîyîm* (6 times, only pl.).[15]

One striking feature is the concentration of occurrences of *ṣîyâ* in several of the prophetic books (3 times in Isaiah, 3 in Jeremiah, once each in Ezekiel, Hosea, and Zephaniah), the Psalms (4 times), and Job (twice); this picture does not change with the addition of *ṣāyôn* (twice in Isaiah) and *ṣîyîm* (3 in Isaiah, once in Jeremiah, twice in the Psalms); by contrast, these terms do not occur at all in the Pentateuch or the historical books, a striking difference over against the terms *miḏbār* and *'ᵃrāḇâ*, which occur frequently in the same context with *ṣîyâ* and yet do indeed occur in these parts of the OT. The explanation is probably that *ṣîyâ* refers to aridity as a characteristic geographical feature or (as an abbreviation of the expression *'ereṣ ṣîyâ*?) to an arid region in a more general sense, whereas *miḏbār* and *'ᵃrāḇâ* are themselves geographical terms referring to specific landscapes (for which aridity is but one of several characteristic features) and as such can be applied to concrete regions, something confirmed by their construct relationship with geographical names. Hence the latter are better suited to texts that recount events from Israel's history than is *ṣîyâ*, which occurs only in metaphorical prophetic sayings and poetic texts.

III. LXX. The LXX renders *ṣîyâ* 10 times with *ánydros*, 3 times with *dipsḗn*, and once each with *érēmos* or *xērós* (*ṣîyâ* does not occur in Jer. 50:12). In Isa. 23:13 *erēmoún* probably presupposes *ṣîyâ*.

IV. Meaning and Use.

1. *ṣîyâ*. The oldest OT occurrence of *ṣîyâ* is in Hos. 2:5(3). Here Hosea describes the punishment for the harlot wife if she continues her present behavior. The threat of thirst shows clearly that *ṣîyâ* implies an absolute absence of water. The customary positioning of *ṣîyâ* after *miḏbār*[16] shows that *miḏbār* represents the more general term that, to the

---

10. G. Ravasi, *Il Libro dei Salmi*, III (Bologna, 1984), 687, 697-98; to this end, S. Norin, "Ps 133: Zusammenhang und Datierung," *ASTI* 11 (1978) 92, emends the pl. const. *harᵉrê*, which militates against this thesis, to a sg. with *y compaginis*.

11. E.g., H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150* (Eng. trans. 1989), 484.

12. K. Seybold, *Die Wallfahrtspsalmen: Biblisch-theologische Studien* 3 (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1978), 25-27; idem, *Die Psalmen. Urban-Taschenbücher* 382 (Stuttgart, 1986), 50.

13. A different view is taken by Norin, 94; O. Keel, "Kultische Brüderlichkeit — Ps 133," *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie* 23 (1976) 68-80.

14. *Wallfahrtspsalmen*, 38-39.

15. → צִי *ṣî*.

extent it can refer not only to arid wasteland but also to grazing land,[17] is then qualified more closely by the subsequent expression. Only here is a polemic against the Ba'al myth discernible as the background to the threat of aridity. This motif of Yahweh drying up a landscape does recur in Zeph. 2:13 with respect to Nineveh[18] and in Jer. 50:12 and 51:43 (post-Dtr) with respect to Babylon. Threatening cities with a transformation into *ṣîyâ* along with all the other destruction (Zeph. 2:13, *šᵉmāmâ;* Jer. 51:43, *šammâ*) strikes them at their most vulnerable spot insofar as their very existence depends on their water supply, without which they are in fact uninhabitable (cf. Jer. 51:43 with 2:6).

Three passages reverse the motif. Yahweh now transforms an arid landscape into a place of springs and verdant flora. Deutero-Isaiah encourages the exiles with this promise in a text (41:18) from which Ps. 107:35 draws in formulating a similar hymn to Yahweh. Functioning as a bridge within the book of Isaiah,[19] Isa. 35 also alludes to 41:18 in v. 1. Whereas Ps. 107:35 is formulated more universally, the two Isaianic texts seem to refer to the route to be taken by those returning to Zion (Isa. 35:8,10), possibly with a specific reference to Edom among other places.[20]

Hence to the extent that the second exodus will pass through a completely transformed *ṣîyâ,* it transcends even the first. There too, according to Jer. 2:6, Yahweh proved to be the caring God who led his people through a wilderness that was not only a place of aridity *(ṣîyâ),* but also of mortal dangers *(šûḥâ, ṣalmāweṯ);*[21] he did so, however, not by means of any comprehensive or total transformation of the wilderness itself, but rather "only" by means of individual water and food miracles (Ps. 78:16; 105:41).

Joel 2:20 uses *ṣîyâ* not in connection with the transformation of an arid landscape, but with expulsion into an arid and desolate land (*ṣîyâ ûšᵉmāmâ;* cf. Zeph. 2:13), a reference presumably to the Judean and Sinai deserts. The object is a mysterious apocalyptic enemy called "the northern army," which is to die of thirst while its advance and rear guards drown.

Ezk. 19:13 uses the same motif metaphorically in describing how the deportation of the Israelite royal house to Babylon is like transplanting a vine "into a dry and thirsty land." Here *ṣîyâ,* rather than depicting geographical features in Babylon, metaphorically describes the exile as a "drying up" of the Israelite monarchy, whose existence is guaranteed only in its own country (cf. v. 10). This metaphor of a plant unable to grow in dry soil recurs in a different context in Isa. 53:2.[22]

The comparisons in Ps. 63:2(1) (postexilic) and Job 24:19 allude to how wearily the

---

16. Talmon's exceptions (p. 93) do not qualify as such; Zeph. 2:13 has no sequence; for Ps. 78:17 *miḏbār* stands first in v. 15.

17. Talmon, 94.

18. Contra Olivier, 96-97, *ṣîyâ* here is not to be understood in the sense of *ṣîyîm.*

19. See O. H. Steck, *Bereitete Heimkehr: Jesaja 35 als redaktionelle Brücke zwischen dem Ersten und dem Zweiten Jesaja. SBS* 121 (1985).

20. So Steck, *Bereitete Heimkehr,* 19, 43 n. 6.

21. See H.-D. Neef, "Gottes Treue und Israels Untreue: Abfall und Einheit von Jeremia 2:2-13," *ZAW* 99 (1987) 49.

22. See E. Haag, *Gewalt und Gewaltlosigkeit im AT. QD* 96 (1983), 184-85.

arid land thirsts for water and how greedily it absorbs it.[23] Job 30:3, a textually difficult verse,[24] alludes to the sparse or nonexistent vegetation of such areas.

2. *ṣāyôn.* The subst. *ṣāyôn* occurs only in postexilic texts and refers similarly to arid land that withers under the heat (Isa. 25:5) and can be cultivated only with the aid of irrigation (32:2), a task for which the king is responsible.

V. Qumran. In the Qumran writings *ṣîyâ* occurs only in the construct expression with *'ereṣ.* 1QH 8:4 shows that here too the word refers specifically to a lack of water. The author praises the Lord for having placed him by a "spring of waters" in an arid land, i.e., in the Judean desert. The petition of yet another author that the Lord might disperse his enemies into a waterless, desolate land (*'ereṣ ṣîyâ ûšᵉmāmâ,* 4QCatᵃ frs. 12-13, I, 8) strongly recalls Joel 2:20. This text also employs a play on words in that in contrast to those enemies, God's holy ones (among whom the petitioner obviously counts himself) will enter into *ṣîyôn* (l. 10).

Fleischer

23. See *AuS,* I/2, 520.

24. On textual questions see G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 413, though his addition of *'iqrê* before *ṣîyâ* seems unnecessary.

צִיּוֹן *ṣîyôn*

Contents: I. Etymology. II. Occurrences in the MT: Synchronic and Diachronic Statistics. III. Topographical and Archaeological Considerations. IV. Preexilic *ṣîyôn* Theology: 1. Zion Texts in Proto-Isaiah and Micah; 2. Tradition and Redaction in the "Psalms of Zion"; 3. *ṣîyôn* Theology and the First Temple. V. Exilic, Postexilic, and Early Jewish *ṣîyôn* Theology: 1. *ṣîyôn* Theology and the Destruction of the Temple; 2. *ṣîyôn* Theology and the Second Temple; 3. *ṣîyôn* Theology in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. VI. Translations: 1. LXX; 2. Targumim. VII. Qumran.

ṣîyôn. S. Abramsky, "The Attitude Toward the Amorites and Jebusites in the Book of Samuel: Historical Foundation and Ideological Significance" (Heb.), *Zion* 50 (1985) 27-58; P. R. Ackroyd, *Exile and Restoration, OTL* (Philadelphia, 1968); G. W. Ahlström, *Psalm 89* (Lund,

1959); idem, *Aspects of Syncretism in Israelite Religion* (Lund, 1963); idem, *Joel and the Temple Cult of Jerusalem. SVT* 21 (1971); idem, "Heaven on Earth — at Hazor and Arad," in B. A. Pearson, ed., *Religious Syncretism in Antiquity* (Missoula, Mont., 1975), 67-83; idem, "The Travels of the Ark," *JNES* 43 (1984) 141-49; W. F. Albright, "The Babylonian Temple-Tower and the Altar of Burnt-Offering," *JBL* 39 (1920) 137-42; idem, "The *Sinnôr* in the Story of David's Capture of Jerusalem," *JPOS* 2 (1922) 286-90; idem, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan* (Garden City, N.Y., 1968); B. Alfrink, "Der Versammlungsberg in äussersten Norden (Is. 14)," *Bibl* 14 (1933) 41-67; A. Alt, "Jerusalems Aufstieg," *KlSchr,* III, 243-57; idem, "Das Taltor von Jerusalem," ibid., 326-47; B. W. Anderson, *Creation versus Chaos: The Reinterpretation of Mythical Symbolism in the Bible* (New York, 1967); N. Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem* (Jerusalem, 1984); M. Avi-Yonah, "The Walls of Nehemia: A Minimalist View," *IEJ* 4 (1954) 239-48; idem, "Zion, der Schönheit Vollendung," *Ariel* 5 (1968) 29-48; R. Bach, ". . . der Bogenzerbricht, Spieße zerschlägt und Wagen mit Feuer verbrennt," *Probleme biblischer Theologie. FS G. von Rad* (Munich, 1971), 13-26; W. E. Barnes, "David's 'Capture' of the Jebusite 'Citadel' of Zion (2 Sam V 6-9)," *ExpT* 3 (1914) 29-39; H. Barth, *Die Jesaja-Worte in der Josiazeit. WMANT* 48 (1977); J. B. Bauer, "Zions Flüsse. Ps 45(46),5," *Memoria Jerusalem. FS F. Sauer* (Graz, 1977) 59-91; J. Becker, *Israel deutet seine Psalmen. SBS* 18 (1966); U. Berger, et al., eds., *Jerusalem — Symbol und Wirklichkeit* (Berlin, [3]1982); W. Beyerlin, *Die Rettung der Bedrängten in den Feindpsalmen der Einzelnen auf institutionelle Zusammenhänge untersucht. FRLANT* 99 (1970); idem, *Weisheitliche Vergewisserung mit Bezug auf den Zionskult: Studien zum 125. Psalm. OBO* 68 (1985); idem, *Weisheitlich-kultische Heilsordnung: Studien zum 15. Psalm. BThS* 9 (1985); K. Bieberstein and H. Bloedhorn, *Bibliographie zur Topographie und Archäologie Jerusalems* (1988); W. F. Birch, "Zion, the City of David — Where Was It? How Did Joab Make His Way into It? And Who Helped Him?" *PEFQS* (1878) 129-32, 179-89; idem, "Defence of the Cutter (Tzinnor)," *PEFQS* (1890) 200-204; G. Bissoli, "Mākôn-hetoimos: A proposito di Esodo 15,17," *SBFLA* 33 (1983) 53-56; O. Böcher, "Die heilige Stadt im Völkerkrieg: Wandlungen eines apokalyptischen Schemas," *Josephus-Studien. FS O. Michel* (Göttingen, 1974), 55-76; T. Booij, "Some Observations on Ps LXXXVII," *VT* 37 (1987) 16-25; G. Bressan, "L'espugnazione di Sion in 2 Sam 5,6-8//1 Cron 11,4-6 e il problema des '*sinnôr,*'" *Bibl* 25 (1944) 346-81; idem, "El Sinnor (2 Sam. 5,6-8)," *Bibl* 35 (1954) 223-24; J. Bright, *Covenant and Promise* (Philadelphia, 1977); G. Brunet, "Les aveugles et boiteux Jébusite," *Studies in the Historical Books of the OT. SVT* 30 (1979), 65-72; idem, "David et le *ṣinnôr,*" ibid., 73-86; G. Buccellati, "The Enthronement of the King and the Capital City in Texts from Ancient Mesopotamia and Syria," *FS A. L. Oppenheim* (Chicago, 1964), 54-61; idem, *Cities and Nations of Ancient Syria. Studi Semitici* (Rome, 1967); E. D. van Buren, "Mountain-Gods," *Or* 12 (1943) 76-84; T. A. Busink, *Der Tempel von Jerusalem,* 2 vols. (Leiden, 1970-80); W. Cannon, "The Disarmament Passage in Micah II and Micah IV," *Theology* 24 (1930) 2-8; A. Caquot, "Le psaume 47 et la royauté de Yahwé," *RHPR* 39 (1959) 311-37; W. Caspari, "*tabur* (Nabel)," *ZDMG* 86 (1933) 49-65; A. Causse, "Le mythe de la nouvelle Jérusalem de Deutéro-Ésaie à la IIIe Sibylle," *RHPR* 18 (1938) 377-414; idem, "De la Jérusalem terrestre à la Jérusalem céleste," *RHPR* 27 (1947) 12-36; H. Cazelles, "Fille de Sion et théologie mariale dans la Bible," *Bullétin de la Société Française d'Études Mariales* (Paris, 1965) 51-71; idem, "Qui aurait visé, à l'origine Isaïe II 2-5," *VT* 30 (1980) 409-20; B. S. Childs, *Myth and Reality in the OT. SBT* I/27 (1960); idem, *Isaiah and the Assyrian Crisis. SBT* II/3 (1967); J. Christensen, "Tempelbjerg-paradis: En forestillingskreds og dens konstans," *DTT* 49 (1986) 51-61; R. E. Clements, "Deuteronomy and the Jerusalem Cult Tradition," *VT* 15 (1965) 300-312; idem, *God and the Temple* (Oxford, 1965); idem, *Isaiah and the Deliverance of Jerusalem. JSOTSup* 13 (1980); R. J. Clifford, *The Cosmic Mountain in Canaan and the OT. HSM* 4 (1972); idem, "Psalm 89: A Lament over the Davidic Ruler's Continued Failure," *HTR* 73 (1980) 35-47; idem, "In Zion and David a New Beginning: An Interpretation of Ps 78," *Traditions in Transformation. FS F. M. Cross* (Winona Lake, Ind., 1981), 121-41; idem, "Isaiah 55: Invitation to a Feast," *The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth. FS D. N. Freedman* (Winona Lake, Ind., 1983), 27-35; R. L. Cohn, "The Sacred

Mountain in Ancient Israel" (diss., Stanford, 1974); idem, "The Mountains and Mount Zion," *Judaism* 26 (1977) 97-115; idem, "The Senses of a Center," *JAAR* 46 (1978) 63 (abstract); idem, *The Shape of Sacred Space. JAAR Studies in Religion* 23 (Chico, Calif., 1981); C. Conder, *The City of Jerusalem* (London, 1909); J. Coppens, "La royauté de Yahvé dans le Psautier," *ETL* 54 (1978) 1-59; idem, *La relève apocalyptique du messianisme royal, I: La royauté, le règne, le royaume de Dieu, cadre de la relève apocalyptique. BETL* 50 (1979); D. Correa-Gómez, "De significatione Montis Sion in S. Scriptura" (diss., Rome = Franciscanum 2/6 [Bogota, 1960] 5-24; 3/7 [1961] 7-48; 3/8 [1961] 5-57; 3/9 [1961] 5-30); F. M. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic* (Cambridge, Mass., 1973); G. Dalman, "Zion, die Burg Jerusalems," *PJ* 11 (1915) 39-84; idem, *Jerusalem und sein Gelände* (1930; repr. Hildesheim, 1972); J. Daniélou, *Le symbolisme cosmique du temple de Jérusalem. Symbolisme cosmique et monuments religieux*, I (Paris, 1953), 61-64; J. Day, *God's Conflict with the Dragon and the Sea: Echoes of a Canaanite Myth in the OT* (Cambridge, 1985); M. Delcor, "Sion, centre universel. Is 2,1-5," *Études bibliques et orientales de religions comparées* (Leiden, 1979), 92-97; idem, "Le festin d'immortalité sur la montagne de Sion à l'ère eschatologique en Is. 25,6-9," ibid., 122-31; D. Dhanaraj, "Theological Significance of the Motif of Enemies in Selected Psalms of Individual Lament" (diss., Osnabrück, 1988); W. Dietrich, *Jesaja und die Politik. BEvT* 74 (1976); F. Dijkema, "Het hemelsch Jerusalem," *NedTT* 15 (1926) 25-43; D. Dimant, "Jerusalem and the Temple According to the Animal Apocalypse (1 Enoch 85-90) in the Light of the Ideology of the Dead Sea Sect," *Shnaton* 5/6 (1978/79 [1982]) 177-93 (Heb.); H. Donner, "Der Felsen und der Temple," *ZDPV* 93 (1977) 1-11; J. H. Eaton, *Kingship and the Psalms* (Sheffield, [2]1986); D. L. Eiler, "The Origin and History of Zion as a Theological Symbol in Ancient Israel" (diss., Princeton, 1968); O. Eissfeldt, *Baal, Zaphon, Zeus Kasios und der Durchzug der Israeliten durchs Meer* (Halle, 1932); idem, "Silo und Jerusalem," *KlSchr*, III, 417-25; idem, "Psalm 132," *KlSchr*, III, 481-85; M. Eliade, *Patterns in Comparative Religion* (Eng. trans. 1958); idem, *The Sacred and the Profane* (Eng. trans. 1959); A. Fitzgerald, "The Mythological Background for the Presentation of Jerusalem as a Queen and False Worship as Adultery in the OT," *CBQ* 34 (1972) 403-16; idem, "*BTWLT* and *BT* as Titles for Capital Cities," *CBQ* 37 (1975) 167-83; J. W. Flanagan, "Social Transformation and Ritual in 2 Samuel 6," *FS D. N. Freedman*, 361-72; J. P. Floss, *David und Jerusalem: Ziele und Folgen des Stadteroberungsberichts 2 Sam 5,6-9 literaturwissenschaftlich betrachtet. ATS* 30 (1987); D. Flusser, "Jerusalem in the Literature of the Second Temple Period," *Immanuel* 6 (1976) 43-46; G. Fohrer, "Israels Haltung gegenüber den Kanaanäern und anderen Völkern," *JSS* 13 (1968) 64-75; idem, "Zion — Jerusalem im AT," *Studien zur alttestamentlichen Theologie und Geschichte (1949-1966). BZAW* 115 (1969), 195-241; G. Fohrer and E. Lohse, "Σιών," *TDNT*, VII, 292-338; E. R. Follis, "The Holy City as Daughter," in idem, ed., *Directions in Biblical Hebrew Poetry. JSOTSup* 40 (1987), 185-204; L. Fonck, *Jerusalem. Topographia urbis sacrae compendium* (Rome, 1911); H. D. Foos, "Jerusalem in Prophecy" (diss., Dallas, 1965); J. M. Ford, "The Heavenly Jerusalem and Orthodox Judaism," *Donum gentilicium. FS D. Daube* (Oxford, 1978), 215-26; F. Foresti, "Composizione e redazione deuteronomistica in Ex 15,1-18," *Lateranum* 48 (1982) 41-69; T. E. Fretheim, "Psalm 132: A Form-Critical Study," *JBL* 86 (1967) 289-300; V. Fritz, *Tempel und Zelt: Studien zum Tempelbau in Israel und zu dem Zeltheiligtum der Priesterschrift. WMANT* 47 (1977); idem, "Der Tempel Salomos im Licht der neueren Forschung," *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft* 112 (1980) 53-68; K. Fullerton, "The Stone of the Foundation," *AJSL* 37 (1920/21) 1-50; W. Gärte, "Kosmische Vorstellungen im Bilde prähistorischer Zeit: Erdberg, Himmelsberg, Erdnabel und Weltströme," *Anthropos* 9 (1914) 956-79; B. Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the NT. SNTSMS* 1 (1965); K. Galling, *Die Erwählungstraditionen Israels. BZAW* 48 (1928); G. Gatt, *Sion in Jerusalem, was es war, und wo es lag* (Brixen, 1900); H. Gese, "Der Davidsbund und die Zionserwählung," *ZTK* 61 (1964) 10-26 = *Vom Sinai zum Zion. BEvT* 64 (1974), 113-29; M. Görg, *Das Zelt der Begegnung. BBB* 27 (1977); idem, *Gott-König-Reden in Israel und Ägypten. BWANT* 105 (1975); M. D. Goulder, *The Psalms of the Sons of Korah. JSOTSup* 20 (1982); J. Gray, *A History of Jerusalem* (London,

1969); H. Gressmann, *Der Messias. FRLANT* 43 (1929); H. Gross, *Die Idee des ewigen und allgemeinen Weltfriedens im Alten Orient und im AT. TTS* 7 (1956); H. Gunkel and J. Begrich, *Intro. to Psalms* (Eng. trans. 1998); E. R. Gutmann, "The Mountain Concept in Israelite Religion" (diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, 1982); W. C. Gwaltney Jr., "The Biblical Book of Lamentations in the Context of Near Eastern Lament Literature," in W. W. Hallo, et al., eds., *Scripture in Context II: More Essays on the Comparative Method* (Winona Lake, Ind., 1983), 191-211; V. Haas, *Hethitische Berggötter und hurritische Steindämonen: Riten, Kulte und Mythen. Kulturgeschichte der antiken Welt* 10 (Mainz, 1982); idem, *Vorzeitmythen und Götterberge in altorientalischer und griechischer Überlieferung. Konstanzer Universitätsreden* 145 (Konstanz, 1983); E. Haglund, *Historical Motifs in the Psalms. CBOT* 23 (1984); D. G. Hagstrom, "The Coherence of the Book of Micah: A Literary Analysis" (diss., Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, 1982); B. Halpern, "The Ritual Background of Zechariah's Temple Song," *CBQ* 40 (1978) 167-90; R. G. Hamerton-Kelly, "The Temple and the Origins of Jewish Apocalyptic," *VT* 20 (1970) 1-15; P. D. Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic* (Philadelphia, 1975); M. Haran, "Shiloh and Jerusalem: The Origin of the Priestly Tradition in the Pentateuch," *JBL* 81 (1962) 14-24; idem, "The Divine Presence in the Israelite Cult and the Cultic Institutions," *Bibl* 50 (1969) 251-67; C. Hardmeier, "Jesajaforschung im Umbruch," *Verkündigung und Forschung. Beihefte zu Evangelische Theologie* 31 (1986) 3-31; C. E. Hauer, "Jerusalem, the Stronghold and Rephaim," *CBQ* 32 (1970) 571-78; J. H. Hayes, "The Tradition of Zion's Inviolability," *JBL* 82 (1963) 419-26; H. V. Hermann, *Omphalos. Orbis Antiquus* 13 (1959); H.-J. Hermisson, "Zukunftserwartung und Gegenwartskritik in der Verkündigung Jesajas," *EvT* 33 (1973) 54-77; S. Herrmann, *Die prophetischen Heilserwartungen im AT. BWANT* 85 (1965); W. Herrmann, "Das Aufleben des Mythos unter den Judäern während des babylonischen Zeitalters," *BN* 40 (1987) 97-129; H. W. Hertzberg, "Der heilige Fels und das AT," *JPOS* 12 (1932) 32-42; D. R. Hillers, "Ritual Procession of the Ark and Ps 132," *CBQ* 30 (1968) 48-55; R. Hillmann, "Wasser und Berg: Kosmische Verbindungslinien zwischen dem kanaanäischen Wettergott und Jahwe" (diss., Halle, 1965); H. Holma, "Zum 'Nabel der Erde,'" *OLZ* 18 (1915) 41-43; I. W. J. Hopkins, *Jerusalem: A Study in Urban Geography* (Grand Rapids, 1970); L. J. Hoppe, "Jerusalem in the Deuteronomistic History," in N. Lohfink, ed., *Das Deuteronomium: Entstehung, Gestalt und Botschaft. BETL* 68 (1985), 107-10; F.-L. Hossfeld, "Einheit und Einzigkeit Gottes im frühen Jahwismus," *Elemente einer trinitarischen Theologie. FS W. Breuning* (Düsseldorf, 1985), 57-74; F. Huber, *Jahwe, Juda und die anderen Völker beim Propheten Jesaja. BZAW* 137 (1976); F. D. Hubmann, "Der 'Weg' zum Zion. Literar- und stilkritsche Beobachtungen zu Jes 35,8-10," *Memoria Jerusalem. FS F. Sauer* (Graz, 1977) 29-41; D. M. Jacobson, "Ideas Concerning the Plan of Herod's Temple," *PEQ* 112 (1980) 33-40; B. Janowski, "'Ich will in eurer Mitte wohnen.' Struktur und Genese der exilischen *Schekina*-theologie," *Jahrbuch für biblische Theologie* 2 (1987) 165-93; idem, *Rettungsgewissheit und Epiphanie des Heils: Das Motiv der Hilfe "am Morgen" im Alten Orient und im AT, I: Alter Orient. WMANT* 59 (1988); K. Jeppesen, "The Cornerstone (Isa. 28:16) in Deutero-Isaianic Rereading of the Message of Isaiah," *ST* 38 (1984) 93-99; C. Jeremias, "Sacharja und die prophetische Tradition, untersucht im Zusammenhang der Exodus-, Zion- und Davidüberlieferung" (diss., Göttingen, 1966/67); idem, *Die Nachtgesichte des Sacharja. FRLANT* 117 (1977); J. Jeremias, *Golgotha. Angelos Beihefte* 1 (Leipzig, 1926); Joh. Jeremias, "Der Gottesberg: Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis der biblischen Symbolsprache" (diss., Kiel, 1919); Jörg Jeremias, "Lade und Zion," *Probleme biblischer Theologie. FS G. von Rad* (Munich, 1971), 183-98 = *Das Königtum Gottes in den Psalmen: Israels Begegnung mit dem kanaanäischen Mythos in den Jahwe-König-Psalmen. FRLANT* 141 (1987) 167-82; idem, *Theophanie: Die Geschichte einer alttestamentlichen Gattung. WMANT* 10 ([2]1977); idem, "Gott und Geschichte im AT. Überlegungen zum Geschichtsverständnis im Nord- und Südreich Israels," *EvT* 40 (1980) 381-96; idem, *Das Königtum Gottes in den Psalmen;* A. R. Johnson, *Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel* (Cardiff, [2]1967); H. Junker, "Der Strom, dessen Arme die Stadt Gottes erfreuen (Ps 46,5)," *Bibl* 43 (1962) 197-201; idem, "Sancta Civitas, Jerusalem Nova," *FS M. Weber. TTS* 15 (1962),

17-33; O. Kaiser, *Die mythische Bedeutung des Meeres in Ägypten, Ugarit und Israel. BZAW* 78 ([2]1962); O. Keel, "Kultische Brüderlichkeit — Ps 133," *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie* 23 (1976) 68-80; K. M. Kenyon, *Royal Cities of the OT* (London, 1971); idem, *Digging Up Jerusalem* (London, 1974); R. Kilian, *Jesaja 1–39. EdF* 200 (1983); E. Klamroth, *Lade und Tempel* (Gütersloh, 1932); C. Kloos, *Yhwh's Combat with the Sea* (Leiden, 1986); K. Koch, "Zur Geschichte der Erwählungsvorstellung in Israel," *ZAW* 67 (1955) 205-26; idem, "Tempeleinlassliturgien und Dekaloge," *Studien zur Theologie der alttestamentlichen Überlieferungen. FS G. von Rad* (Neukirchen, 1961), 45-60; H.-J. Kraus, "Archäologische und topographische Probleme Jerusalems im Lichte der Psalmenexegese," *ZDPV* 75 (1959) 125-40; idem, *Worship in Israel* (Eng. trans. 1966); idem, "The Cultic Traditions of Jerusalem," *Psalms 1–59* (Eng. trans. 1987), 81-88; idem, "The Glorification of the City of God," ibid., 89-92; idem, *Theology of the Psalms* (Eng. trans. 1986); S. Krauss, "Zion and Jerusalem: A Linguistic and Historical Study," *PEQ* 77 (1945) 15-33; idem, "Moriah-Ariel," *PEQ* 79 (1946) 45-55, 102-11; L. Krinetzki, "Zur Poetik und Exegese von Ps 48," *BZ* 4 (1960) 70-97; idem, "Der anthologische Stil des 46. Psalms und seine Bedeutung für die Datierungsfrage," *Münchener theologische Zeitschrift* 12 (1961) 52-71; A. Laato, *Who Is Immanuel? The Rise and the Foundering of Isaiah's Messianic Expectations* (Åbo, 1988), esp. 80-88; S. Lach, "Versuch einer neuen Interpretation der Zionshymnen," *Congress Volume, Göttingen 1977. SVT* 29 (1978), 149-64; E.-M. Laperrousaz, "A propos du 'premier mur' et du 'deuxième mur' de Jérusalem, ainsi que du rempart de Jérusalem à l'époque de Néhémi," *REJ* 138 (1979) 1-16; idem, "Le problème du 'premier mur' et du 'deuxième mur' de Jérusalem après la réfutation décisive de la 'minimalist view,'" *Études d'histoire et de pensée juives. FS G. Vajda* (Louvain, 1980), 13-35; idem, "Quelques remarques sur le rempart de Jérusalem à l'époque de Néhémie," *Folio Orientalia* 21 (Kraków, 1980) 179-85; A. S. Lawhead, "A Study of the Theological Significance of *yāšab* in the MT, with Attention to Its Translation in the Septuagint" (diss., Boston Univ., 1975); N. P. Lemche, *Ancient Israel: A New History of Israelite Society* (Sheffield, 1988); J. D. Levenson, *Theology of the Program of Restoration of Ezekiel 40–48. HSM* 10 (1976); idem, "From Temple to Synagogue: 1 Kings," *Traditions in Transformation. FS F. M. Cross* (Winona Lake, Ind., 1981), 143-66; idem, "The Temple and the World," *JR* 64 (1984) 275-98; idem, *Sinai and Zion* (Minneapolis, 1985); E. Lipiński, *La royauté de Yahwé dans la poésie et le culte de l'Ancien Israël* (Brussels, [2]1968); S. Loffreda, "Ancora sul *ṣinnôr* di 2 Sam 5,8," *SBFLA* 32 (1982) 59-72; N. Lohfink, "Zur deuteronomischen Zentralisationsformel," *Bibl* 65 (1984) 297-329; O. Loretz, *Die Psalmen II: Beitrag der Ugarit-Texte zum Verständnis von Kolometrie und Textologie der Psalmen. Psalm 90–150. AOAT* 207/2 (1979); idem, *Der Prolog des Jesaja-Buches (1,1–2,5): Ugaritologische und kolometrische Studien zum Jesaja-Buch, I. Ugaritisch-Biblische Literatur* 1 (Altenberge/Soest, 1984); H. M. Lutz, *Jahwe, Jerusalem und die Völker: Zur Vorgeschichte von Sach 12,1-8 und 14,1-5. WMANT* 27 (1968); R. A. F. MacKenzie, "The City and Israelite Religion," *CBQ* 25 (1963) 60-70; T. W. Mann, *Divine Presence and Guidance in Israelite Traditions: The Typology of Exaltation* (Baltimore, 1977); J. Marböck, "Das Gebet um die Rettung Zions: Sir 36,1-22 (G: 33,1-13a; 36,16b-22) im Zusammenhang der Geschichtsschau Ben Siras," *Memoria Jerusalem. FS F. Sauer* (Graz, 1977), 93-115; R. Martin-Achard, "Esaïe LIV et la nouvelle Jérusalem," *Congress Volume, Vienna 1980. SVT* 32 (1981), 260-84 = *Cahiers RTP* 11 (1984) 260-84; H. G. May, "Some Cosmic Connotations of *Mayim Rabbîm,* 'Many Waters,'" *JBL* 74 (1955) 9-21; B. Mazar (Maisler), "Das vordavidische Jerusalem," *JPOS* 10 (1930) 181-91; idem, *Der Berg des Herrn: Neue Ausgrabungen in Jerusalem* (Bergisch Gladbach, 1979); idem, "Jerusalem in Biblical Times," *Jerusalem Cathedra* 2 (1982) 1-24; idem, "Josephus Flavius — the Historian of Jerusalem" (Heb.), in U. Rappaport, ed., *Josephus Flavius: Historian of Eretz-Israel in the Hellenistic-Roman Period* (Jerusalem, 1982), 1-5; idem, "The Temple Mount," in J. Amitai, ed., *Biblical Archaeology Today* (Jerusalem, 1985), 463-68; P. K. McCarter, "The Ritual Dedication of the City of David in 2 Samuel 6," *FS D. N. Freedman,* 273-78; J. G. McConville, *Law and Theology in Deuteronomy. JSOTSup* 33 (1984); R. J. McKelvey,

The New Temple (Oxford, 1969); R. P. Merendino, "Jes 49,14-26: Jahwes Bekenntnis zu Sion und die neue Heilszeit," *RB* 89 (1982) 321-69; A. L. Merrill, "Psalm XXIII and the Jerusalem Tradition," *VT* 15 (1965) 354-60; T. N. D. Mettinger, "YHWH SABAOTH — The Heavenly King on the Cherubim Throne," in T. Ishida, ed., *Studies in the Period of David and Solomon and Other Essays* (Winona Lake, Ind., 1982), 109-38; idem, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth: Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies. CBOT* 18 (1982); idem, "Fighting the Powers of Chaos and Hell — Towards the Biblical Portrait of God," *ST* 39 (1985) 21-38; M. Metzger, "Himmlische und irdische Wohnstatt Jahwes," *UF* 2 (1970) 139-58; idem, "Gottheit, Berg und Vegetation in vorderorientalischer Bildtradition," *ZDPV* 99 (1983) 54-94; idem, *Königsthron und Gottesthron: Thronformen und Throndarstellungen in Ägypten und im Vorderen Orient im dritten und zweiten Jahrtausend vor Christus und deren Bedeutung für das Verständnis von Aussagen über den Thron im AT. AOAT* 15/1-2 (1985); idem, "Der Thron als Manifestation der Herrschermacht in der Ikonographie des Vorderen Orients und im AT," in T. Rendtorff, ed., *Charisma und Institution* (Gütersloh, 1985), 250-96; C. L. Meyers, "The Elusive Temple," *BA* 45 (1982) 33-41; J. M. Miller, "Jebus and Jerusalem: A Case of Mistaken Identity," *ZDPV* 90 (1974) 115-27; P. D. Miller, *The Divine Warrior in Early Israel. HSM* 5 (^{2}1975); G. Molin, "Das Motiv vom Chaoskampf im alten Orient und in den Traditionen Jerusalems und Israels," *Memoria Jerusalem. FS F. Sauer* (Graz, 1977), 13-28; C. Mommert, *Topographie des alten Jerusalem, I: Zion und Akra. Der Hügel der Altstadt* (Leipzig, 1902); J. Morgenstern, "Psalm 48," *HUCA* 16 (1941) 1-95; S. Mowinckel, *Psalmenstudien II: Das Thronbesteigungsfest Jahwäs und der Ursprung der Eschatologie* (1921; repr. Amsterdam, 1966); idem, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship* (Eng. trans. 1962); W. Müller, *Die heilige Stadt: Roma quadrata, himmlisches Jerusalem und die Mythe vom Weltnabel* (Stuttgart, 1961); J. Muilenburg, "Psalm 47," in T. F. Best, ed., *Hearing and Speaking the Word: Selections from the Work of J. Muilenburg* (Chico, Calif., 1984), 86-107; L. Neve, "The Common Use of Traditions by the Author of Psalm 46 and Isaiah," *ExpT* 86 (1974/75) 243-46; G. Neville, *City of Our God* (London, 1971); A. de Nicola, "Quasi cypressus in monte Sion," *BeO* 17 (1975) 269-77; H. Niehr, "Bedeutung und Funktion kanaanäischer Traditionselemente in der Sozialkritik Jesajas," *BZ* 28 (1984) 69-81; E. von Nordheim, "König und Tempel: Der Hintergrund des Tempelbauverbots in 2 Samuel VII," *VT* 27 (1977) 434-53; S. I. L. Norin, *Er spaltete das Meer: Die Auszugsüberlieferung in Psalmen und Kult des alten Israel. CBOT* 9 (1977); M. Noth, "Jerusalem and the Israelite Tradition," *Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Studies* (Eng. trans. 1966), 132-44; M. Oeming, "Zur Topographie und Archäologie Jerusalems," *Nehemia. KAT* XIX/2 (1987), 180-94; A. Ohler, *Mythologische Elemente im AT* (Düsseldorf, 1969); J. P. J. Olivier, "A Possible Interpretation of the Word *ṣiyyâ* in Zeph. 2,13," *JNSL* 8 (1980) 95-97; B. C. Ollenburger, *Zion, the City of the Great King: A Theological Symbol of the Jerusalem Cult. JSOTSup* 41 (1987); E. Otto, "Silo und Jerusalem," *TZ* 32 (1976) 65-77; idem, "Jerusalem," *RLA*, V, 278-81; idem, *Jerusalem — die Geschichte der Heiligen Stadt: Von den Anfängen bis zur Kreuzfahrerzeit* (Stuttgart, 1980); idem, "El und Jhwh in Jerusalem: Historische und theologische Aspekte einer Religionsintegration," *VT* 30 (1980) 316-29; idem, "'Dem Krieg gebietet er Einhalt bis an die Enden der Welt': Der Gottesfrieden im AT unter den Bedingungen des Unfriedens," *"Mach uns zum Werkzeug deines Friedens,"* ed. Kirchenleitung der Nordelbischen Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche (1982), 16-20; idem, "Feste und Feiertage II. AT," *TRE*, XI, 96-106; idem, "Schöpfung als Kategorie der Vermittlung von Gott und Welt in biblischer Theologie: Die Theologie alttestamentlicher Schöpfungsüberlieferungen im Horizont der Christologie," *"Wenn nicht jetzt, wann dann?" FS H. J. Kraus* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1983), 53-68; idem, "Kultus und Ethos in Jerusalemer Theologie: Ein Beitrag zur theologischen Begründung der Ethik im AT," *ZAW* 98 (1986) 161-79; idem, "Mythos und Geschichte: Zu einer neuen Arbeit von Jörg Jeremias," *BN* 42 (1988) 93-102; idem, "Jerusalem," *Encyclopedia of Christianity*, III (Eng. trans. 2002), s.v.; idem and T. Schramm, *Festival and Joy* (Eng. trans. 1980); M. Ottosson, "Fortifikation och Tempel: En studie i Jerusalems topografi," *Religion och Bibel* 38 (Uppsala, 1979) 26-39; idem, *Temples and Cult Places in Palestine. Acta Univ. Uppsala*

12 (Uppsala, 1980); B. Otzen, H. Gottlieb, and K. Jeppesen, *Myths in the OT* (London, 1980); G. Pace, "Gebus sul monte e Shalem sul colle," *BeO* 20 (1978) 213-24; idem, "Il colle della città di Davide," *BeO* 25 (1983) 171-82; R. Patai, *Man and Temple* (New York, 1967); J. Pedersen, *ILC*, III-IV, esp. 235-40, 524-34; L. G. Perdue, "'Yahweh Is King over All the Earth': An Exegesis of Psalm 47," *Restoration Quarterly* 17 (1974) 85-98; A. Peter, "Der Segensstrom des endzeitlichen Jerusalem — Herkunft und Bedeutung eines prophetischen Symbols," *Miscellanea Fuldensia. Beiträge aus Geschichte, Theologie, Seelsorge. FS A. Bolte* (Fulda, 1967), 109-34; F. E. Peters, *Jerusalem and Mecca: The Typology of the Holy City in the Near East. New York University Studies in Near Eastern Civilization* 11 (New York, 1986); B. Pixner, "Der Sitz der Urkirche wird zum neuen Zion," *FS des theologischen Studienjahres der Dormition Abbey Jerusalem. FS L. Klein* (Jerusalem, 1986), 65-76; N. W. Porteous, "Shalem — Shalom," *GUOST* 10 (1943) 1-7; idem, "Jerusalem — Zion: The Growth of a Symbol," *Verbannung und Heimkehr. FS W. Rudolph* (Tübingen, 1961), 235-52 = *Living the Mystery: Collected Essays* (Oxford, 1967), 93-111; J. C. Porter, "The Interpretation of 2 Samuel VI and Psalm CXXXII," *JTS* 5 (1954) 161-73; E. Power, "Sion or Si'on in Psalm 133 (Vulg 132)?" *Bibl* 3 (1922) 342-49; H. Y. Priebatsch, "Jerusalem und die Brunnenstrasse Merneptahs," *ZDPV* 91 (1975) 18-29; O. Procksch, "Das Jerusalem Jesajas," *PJ* 26 (1930) 12-40; G. von Rad, "The City on the Hill," *Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays* (Eng. trans. 1966), 232-42; idem, *Theology of the OT*, 2 vols. (Eng. trans. 1962-65), II, esp. 155-69; L. Ramlot, "La ville de Yahvé," *BVC* 33 (1960) 34-47; G. Ravasi, "La madre Sion," *Parola, Spirito e Vita* 6 (1982) 36-52; J. A. Reinken, "The Promise of Jerusalem's Restoration: A New Approach to Isaiah 40–66" (diss., Chicago, 1967); B. Renaud, *La formation du livre de Michée. ÉBib* (1977); R. Rendtorff, "El, Ba'al und Jahwe: Erwägungen zum Verhältnis kanaanäischer und israelitischer Religion," *ZAW* 78 (1966) 277-92; J. Renkema, *"Misschien is er hoop. . ." De theologische vooronderstellingen van het boek Klaagliederen* (Franeker, 1983); J. Retsö, "Tempelplatsen i Jerusalem i Islams traditioner," *Religion och Bibel* 38 (1979) 41-53; J. J. M. Roberts, "The Davidic Origin of the Zion Tradition," *JBL* 92 (1973) 329-44; idem, "The Religio-political Setting of Psalm 47," *BASOR* 221 (1976) 129-32; idem, "Zion Tradition," *IDBSup*, 985-87; idem, "Myth *Versus* History," *CBQ* 38 (1976) 1-13; idem, "Zion in the Theology of the Davidic-Solomonic Empire," in Ishida, ed., *Studies in the Period of David and Solomon*, 93-108; idem, "Isaiah 33: An Isaianic Elaboration of the Zion Tradition," *FS D. N. Freedman*, 15-25; A. Robinson, "Zion and *Ṣāphôn* in Psalm XLVIII 3," *VT* 24 (1974) 118-23; idem, "The Zion Concept in the Psalms and Deutero-Isaiah" (diss., Edinburgh, 1974); E. Robinson, *Biblical Researches in Palestine and the Adjacent Countries: Later Biblical Researches etc.*, I-III (London, 1867); E. Rohland, "Die Bedeutung der Erwählungstraditionen Israels für die Eschatologie der alttestamentlichen Propheten" (diss., Heidelberg, 1956); L. Rosso Ubigli, "Dalla 'Nuova Gerusalemme' alla 'Gerusalemme Celeste,' contributo per la comprensione dell'apocalittica," *Henoch* 3 (1981) 69-80; K. Rupprecht, *Der Tempel von Jerusalem — Gründung Salomos oder jebusitischen Erbe? BZAW* 144 (1977); A. Safran, "Jérusalem, coeur d'Israël, coeur du monde," *Mélanges A. Neher* (Paris, 1975), 127-35; H. W. F. Saggs, *The Encounter with the Divine in Mesopotamia and Israel. Jordan Lectures 1976* (London, 1978); J. A. Sanders, "The Scroll of Psalms (11 QPs[a]) from Cave 11: A Preliminary Report," *BASOR* 165 (1962) 11-15; idem, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumrân Cave 11 (11 QPs[a]). DJD* IV (1965); X. Santanna, "Temple and Cult in the Prophets of the Restoration" (diss., Richmond, 1973); J. de Savignac, "Le sens du terme *ṣâphôn*," *UF* 16 (1984) 273-78; B. Schaller, "'Ἥξει ἐκ Σιὼν ὁ ῥυόμενος: Zur Textgestalt von Jes 59:20f. in Röm 11:26f.," *De Septuaginta. FS J. W. Wevers* (Mississauga, 1984), 201-6; H. Schmid, "Jahwe und die Kulttraditionen von Jerusalem," *ZAW* 67 (1955) 168-97; H. H. Schmid, *Šalôm. "Frieden" im Alten Orient und im AT. SBS* 51 (1971); Hans Schmidt, *Der heilige Fels in Jerusalem: Eine archäologische und religionsgeschichtliche Studie* (Tübingen, 1933); Helmut Schmidt, "Israel, Zion und die Völker" (diss., Zurich, 1968); K.-L. Schmidt, "Jerusalem als Urbild und Abbild," *Aus der Welt der Urbilder. FS C. G. Jung. Eranos-Jahrbuch* 18 (Zurich, 1950), 207-48; M. Schmidt, *Prophet und Tempel: Eine*

Studie zum Problem der Gottesnähe im AT (Zurich, 1948); W. H. Schmidt, "מִשְׁכָּן als Ausdruck Jerusalemer Kultsprache," *ZAW* 75 (1963) 91-92; idem, "Jerusalemer El-Traditionen bei Jesaja. Ein religionsgeschichtlicher Vergleich zum Vorstellungskreis des göttlichen Königtums," *ZRGG* 16 (1964) 302-13; idem, *Königtum Gottes in Ugarit und Israel: Zur Herkunft der Königsprädikation Jahwes. BZAW* 80 (²1966); idem, *The Faith of the OT: A History* (Eng. trans. 1983); J. J. Schmitt, "The Zion Drama in the Tradition of Isaiah ben Amos" (diss., Univ. of Chicago, 1977); idem, "Pre-Israelite Jerusalem," in C. D. Evans, et al., eds., *Scripture in Context. PTMS* 34 (1980), 101-21; idem, "Motherhood of God and Zion as Mother," *RB* 92 (1985) 557-69; G. Schnorrenberger, "Der Sion in der alttestamentlichen Offenbarungsentwicklung" (diss., Trier, 1966); W. Schottroff, "Die Friedensfeier: Das Prophetenwort von der Umwandlung von Schwerten zu Pflugscharen (Jes 2,2-5/Mi 4,1-5)," in L. and W. Schottroff, eds., *Die Parteilichkeit Gottes* (Munich, 1984), 78-102; J. Schreiner, *Sion — Jerusalem, Jahwes Königssitz: Theologie der Heiligen Stadt im AT. SANT* 7 (1963); K.-D. Schunck, "Juda und Jerusalem in vor- und frühisraelitischer Zeit," *Studien zu Glaube und Geschichte Israels. FS A. Jespen. AzT* I/46 (1971), 50-57; V. Scippa, "Davide conquista Gerusalemme," *BeO* 27 (1985) 65-76; J. A. Seeligman, "Jerusalem in Jewish-Hellenistic Thought" (Heb.), *Juda and Jerusalem. 12th Annual Archaeological Convention* (Jerusalem, 1959), 192-208; K. Seybold, *Die Wallfahrtspsalmen: Studien zur Entstehungsgeschichte von Ps 120–134. BThS* 3 (1978); idem, *Introducing the Psalms* (Eng. trans. 1990); H. Shanks, *The City of David: A Guide to Biblical Jerusalem* (Tel Aviv, ²1975); idem, "The City of David after Five Years of Digging," *BAR* 11 (1985) 22-38; Y. Shiloh, *Excavations at the City of David I. Qedem* 19 (Jerusalem, 1984); idem, "The Material Culture of Judah and Jerusalem in Iron Age II: Origins and Influences," in E. Lipiński, ed., *The Land of Israel: Cross-roads of Civilizations* (Louvain, 1985), 113-46; J. Simons, *Jerusalem in the OT* (Leiden, 1959); E. B. Smick, "Mythopoetic Language in the Psalms," *WTJ* 44 (1982) 88-98; G. A. Smith, *Jerusalem: The Topography, Economics and History from the Earliest Times to* A.D. *70*, I-II (1907-8; repr. New York, 1972); M. S. Smith, "The Structure of Psalm LXXXVII," *VT* 38 (1988) 357-58; idem, *God and Zion: Form and Meaning in Ps 48. Studi Epigrafici e Linguistici* 6 (Verona, 1989); L. Smolar, M. Aberbach, and P. Churgin, *Studies in Targum Jonathan to the Prophets* (New York, 1983); J. A. Soggin, "Der offiziell geförderte Synkretismus in Israel während des 10. Jahrhunderts," *ZAW* 78 (1966) 179-204; A. Spreafico, "Gerusalemme, città di pace e di giustizia," *Gerusalemme. Atti della XXVI Settimana biblica* (Brescia, 1982), 81-98; L. E. Stager, "The Archaeology of the East Slope of Jerusalem and the Terraces of the Kidron," *JNES* 41 (1982) 111-21; J. J. Stamm, "Der Weltfriede im AT," in idem and H. Bietenhard, eds., *Der Weltfriede im Alten und Neuen Testament* (Zurich, 1959), 7-63; O. H. Steck, "Jerusalemer Vorstellungen vom Frieden und ihre Abwandlungen in der Prophetie des alten Israel," in G. Liedke, ed., *Frieden — Bibel — Kirche* (Stuttgart, 1972), 75-95; idem, *Friedensvorstellungen im alten Jerusalem: Psalmen, Jesaja, Deuterojesaja. ThS* 111 (1972); S. Ö. Steingrimsson, *Tor der Gerechtigkeit: Eine literaturwissenschaftliche Untersuchung der sogenannten Einzugsliturgien im AT: Ps 15; 24,3-5 und Jes 33,14-16. ATS* 22 (1984); W. F. Stinespring, "No Daughter of Zion," *Encounter* 26 (1965) 133-41; H. J. Stoebe, "Die Einnahme Jerusalems und der Ṣinnôr," *ZDPV* 73 (1957) 73-99; F. Stolz, *Strukturen und Figuren im Kult von Jerusalem. BZAW* 118 (1970); idem, "צִיּוֹן *ṣiyyôn* Zion," *TLOT*, II, 1071-76; idem, "Erfahrungsdimensionen im Reden von der Herrschaft Gottes," *WuD* 15 (1979) 9-32; H. Strauss, "Das Meerlied des Mose — ein 'Siegeslied' Israels?" *ZAW* 97 (1985) 103-9; idem, *Gott preisen heisst vor ihm leben. Exegetische Studien zum Verständnis von acht ausgewählten Psalmen Israels. BThS* 12 (1988); E. L. Sukenik, "The Account of David's Capture of Jerusalem," *JPOS* 8 (1928) 12-16; S. Talmon, "The Biblical Concept of Jerusalem," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 8 (1971) 300-316; idem, "Die Bedeutung Jerusalems in der Bibel," in W. P. Eckert, et al., eds., *Jüdisches Volk — gelobtes Land. Abhandlungen zum christlich-jüdischen Dialog* 3 (Munich, 1970), 135-52; idem, "Jerusalem in Ancient Times," *Journal of the Central Conference of American Rabbis* 24 (1977) 11-18; idem, "The 'Navel of the Earth' and the Comparative Method,"

The noun *ṣahwē/ṣahwat,* "crest of a hill, citadel," may derive from Arab. *ṣawā/ṣawiya.*[15] On this view *ṣîyôn* as derived from **ṣyy* represents a substantive construction with the afformative *-ôn* frequently attested in place-names (< **an*),[16] a construction making a statement about the disposition of the place itself.[17]

Considering the semantic connotation of "arid area" and the proximity of the city settlement to the *gîḥôn* spring, Priebatsch suggests that *ṣîyôn* then refers to an area north of the city settlement itself such that David settled in the vicinity of the first temple when he built the *'îr dāwiḏ* north of the city precinct.[18] More recent excavations on the southeast hill, however, suggest a different scenario. Defectively written *m^eṣuḏaṯ ṣîyôn* means "mountain fortress" rather than "hiding place." During the Late Bronze Age (14th/13th century), a terrace was erected above the *'ên gîḥôn* and probably served as the substructure for a podium connected with a pre-Israelite acropolis.[19] This scenario easily explains the identification of *m^eṣuḏaṯ ṣîyôn* and abs. *ṣîyôn* with the *'îr dāwiḏ* in 2 S. 5:7 (1 Ch. 11:5) and 1 K. 8:1 (2 Ch. 5:2). That is, *m^eṣuḏaṯ ṣîyôn* refers to the (Late Bronze Age) acropolis that became the *'îr dāwiḏ* after David took the city. The development of the semantic connotation of *ṣîyôn* corresponds to that of Arab. *ṣahwē,* "fortress."[20] The term *ṣîyôn,* "mountain ridge," derives from **ṣyy;* as a rule it is without springs and dry in contrast to valleys. The connotation of "mountain ridge" also generates that of military protection such that *ṣîyôn* can also designate a "fortress" *(m^eṣuḏâ).* In that sense there is no need to suggest that *ṣîyôn* originally referred to the entire southeast hill area as a "dry area" and was only secondarily applied to the fortress; given the proximity of the *'ên gîḥôn,* such a thesis is rather improbable.[21] The proper name of the *m^eṣuḏaṯ ṣîyôn* was in fact *ṣîyôn* with its connotation of protection.

II. Occurrences in the MT: Synchronic and Diachronic Statistics. The proper name *ṣîyôn* occurs 152 times in the MT, including 93 in the prophetic writings (46 in Isaiah;[22] 17 in Jeremiah; 7 in Joel; 2 each in Amos and Obadiah; 9 in Micah; 2 in Zephaniah; 8 in Zechariah), 53 in the poetic writings (37 in the Psalms;[23] 15 in Lamentations; 1 in Canticles), and 6 in the narrative writings (2 Samuel; 1/2 Kings par. 1/2 Chronicles). The term does not occur in Genesis–Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, 1 Samuel, Ruth, Ezra, Nehemiah, Job, Proverbs, Ezekiel, Daniel, Hosea, Jonah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Haggai, or Malachi. Only a few occurrences date reliably to the preexilic period. In the narrative writings *ṣîyôn* is preexilic in 2 S. 5:7; in the prophetic writings in Isa. 1:8; 3:16-17; 8:18; 10:32; 28:16; 31:4; Jer. 4:6,31; 6:2,23; 14:19(?);

15. A. Robinson, "Zion and Saphon in Psalm 48:3," *VT* 24 (1974) 122.

16. W. Borrée, *Die alten Ortsnamen Palästinas* (1930; repr. Hildesheim, ²1968), 60ff.; cf., however, *BLe,* 500-501.

17. Dalman, *Jerusalem,* 126; Otto, *RLA,* V, 280.

18. Priebatsch, 19.

19. Shiloh, *Excavations,* 15ff.

20. See G. A. Smith, *Jerusalem,* I, 144-45.

21. Dalman, *Jerusalem,* 126.

22. Concerning Isa. 30:19, see H. Wildberger, *Jesaja (28–39). BK* X/3 (1982), in loc.

23. Concerning Ps. 133:3, see Seybold, *Die Wallfahrtspsalmen,* 26 n. 7.

ered a fortified wall, a tunnel leading to the Spring Gihon ("Warren's shaft"), and in 1880 the Siloam inscription[30] at the exit of Hezekiah's Tunnel along with ceramics from the early 3d millennium on the southeast hill.[31] During their own excavations on the southwest hill (1894-97), F. J. Bliss and A. C. Dickie found no signs of any pre-Israelite settlement,[32] lending credence to the thesis that the history of pre-Hellenistic Jerusalem was limited to the southeast hill.[33] For Dalman and Simons,[34] the city that even during the pre-Israelite period was called Jerusalem encompassed the southwest hill, while the *mᵉṣuḏaṯ ṣîyôn* and *'îr dāwiḏ* were located on the southeast hill. More recent excavations on the southwest hill were similarly unable to confirm this modification to the thesis, since the earliest settlement on the southwest hill does not appear until the 8th century.[35] These findings also undermine Pace's recent attempts to renew the two-hill theory.

The most recent excavations on the southeast hill have clarified the history of the *mᵉṣuḏaṯ ṣîyôn* in relation to the urban settlement Jerusalem during the Bronze and Iron Age.[36] Kenyon determined that Jerusalem was founded as a fortified settlement during the Middle Bronze Age (18th/17th century)[37] and expanded during the Late Bronze Age (14th/13th century) by a complex system of terraces. Shiloh's excavations clarified the history of a complex above the *'ên gîḥôn* that is probably to be associated with the acropolis of the *mᵉṣuḏaṯ ṣîyôn* and the *'îr dāwiḏ.*[38] A complex called a "Jebusite ramp" and understood as a pre-Israelite city fortification was excavated that Kenyon interpreted as an additional strengthening of the postexilic city wall undertaken during the Hellenistic period;[39] Y. Shiloh recognized it as the "stepped stone structure" of an Iron Age supporting wall and substructure for a podium on which the Davidic acropolis with its palace (2 S. 5:11), namely, the *'îr dāwiḏ,* might have been located. This complex lies directly on top of a Late Bronze Age substructural system that probably also supported the pre-Israelite acropolis and thus might be associated with the *mᵉṣuḏaṯ ṣîyôn.* 2 S. 5:6-9 is thus probably recounting how David took the acropolis rather than the city, and is an account irreconcilable with the taking of a city by means of negotiations in analogy to Gibeon.[40]

---

30. *KAI,* no. 189; see V. Sasson, "The Siloam Tunnel Inscription," *PEQ* 114 (1982) 111-17.

31. See L.-H. Vincent, *Jérusalem sous terre* (London, 1911), 31-32, pls. IX-X; L.-H. Vincent and Stève, pls. CXXXI-CXXXIII. Concerning the history of earlier excavations on the southeast hill, see Simons, 68ff.

32. *Excavations in Jerusalem* (London, 1898).

33. Alt, "Das Taltor," 326ff.; W. F. Albright, "Recent Works on the Topography and Archaeology of Jerusalem," *JQR* 22 (1932) 414.

34. Dalman, *PJ* 11 (1915) 39ff.; idem, *Jerusalem,* 80ff.; Simons, 243ff.

35. See Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem,* 26-31.

36. Kenyon, *Digging Up Jerusalem,* 76ff.; Shiloh, *Excavations,* 25ff.

37. See Shiloh, *Excavations,* 12, 26.

38. → עיר *'îr,* XI, 58.

39. First excavated by R. A. S. Macalister and J. G. Duncan, *Excavations on the Hill of Ophel, Jerusalem, 1923-25* (London, 1926), 49-78; see Kenyon, *Digging Up Jerusalem,* 48, 192-93.

40. So C. Schäfer-Lichtenberger, *Stadt und Eidgenossenschaft im AT: Eine Auseinandersetzung mit Max Webers Studie "Das antike Judentum." BZAW* 156 (1983), 385ff.; Floss, 41-42.

Although Kenyon's excavations made it possible to identify the *ṣinnôr* with "Warren's shaft"[41] and thus to explain the taking of the *mᵉṣuḏaṯ ṣîyôn* by means of military deception, this hypothesis too has been discredited.[42] Even if one disagrees with Shiloh's late dating of "Warren's shaft" to the Israelite monarchy,[43] our current understanding of the substructural system makes it difficult to establish any connection with the taking of the acropolis. With the taking of the *mᵉṣuḏaṯ ṣîyôn,* the city fell into David's hands.

Subsequent construction in Jerusalem also influenced the topographical connotations of *ṣîyôn.*[44] After Solomon's new palace and temple north of the Davidic city were built (1 K. 6–7), the acropolis of the Davidic palace (2 S. 5:11) became less significant. The name *ṣîyôn* now extricated itself from the original *mᵉṣuḏâ* and in preexilic passages acquires its linguistic dynamic from the significance of the temple itself[45] for the southeast hill, which into the 8th century is identical with the city precinct of Jerusalem. Ps. 20:3(2) identifies *ṣîyôn* with *qōḏeš,* Ps. 2:6 with *har qoḏšî,*[46] Isa. 31:4 *(har ṣîyôn)* with *giḇʿâ,* Ps. 48:2(1) *har qoḏšô* with *ʿîr ʾᵉlōhênû* (cf. Ps. 46:5[4], *ʿîr "yhwh"*). Ps. 48:13(12) identifies *ṣîyôn* with the city precinct of Jerusalem. References to a fortress as a representation of Yahweh (*zeh "yhwh,"* 48:15[14]) preserve the original connotation of *ṣîyôn* as a fortress and interpret it theologically. The association of *ṣîyôn* with the preexilic royal ideology in 2:6; 20:3(2); 110:2(?) shows that the displacement of the function of the *mᵉṣuḏaṯ ṣîyôn* to the Solomonic palace, which was in its own turn already associated with the temple,[47] made it possible to incorporate *ṣîyôn* into the temple theology, where it became a theologically qualified reference to the southeast hill as the temple mount of the city of Jerusalem.

In this capacity *ṣîyôn* became more prominent during the exilic period. Preexilic associations of *ṣîyôn* with *qōḏeš* (Ps. 134:2-3) and *har qoḏšî* (Joel 2:1; 4:17[3:17]; cf. also Zech. 8:2-3) are now joined by references to the temple mount and the attendant associations with *mᵉqôm šēm yhwh ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ* (Isa. 18:7), *har yhwh* (Mic. 4:2), *môšāḇ* (Ps. 132:13), *hᵃḏōm raglāyw* (Lam. 2:1), and *mōʿᵃḏô* (Lam. 2:6). The intimate connection between *ṣîyôn* and the temple during the Hellenistic period is evident in passages associating it with *skēnḗ hágia* (Sir. 24:10), *laós* (Sir. 36:13), and *hierós toú kyríou* (3 Ezr. 8:78).

These parallels between *(har) ṣîyôn* and Jerusalem are cast within the horizon of what in Ps. 48:3(2) are the overlapping aspects of Zion, the mount of God, and the city of God the King (cf. 2 K. 19:31; Ps. 51:20[18]; 102:22[21]; Isa. 2:3; 4:3; 10:12; 24:23;

---

41. Kenyon, *Digging Up Jerusalem,* 98-99. Concerning the etymology of *ṣinnôr,* see most recently Loffreda; Floss, 22 n. 54 (bibliog.). Concerning "Warren's shaft," see L.-H. Vincent, *RB* 33 (1924) 357ff.; idem and Stève, 631-32.

42. Wenning and Zenger, *UF* 14 (1982) 280.

43. Shiloh, *Excavations,* 23, 27.

44. See Otto, *Jerusalem,* 49ff.

45. Concerning its location, see Donner.

46. → הר *har,* III, 427ff.

47. Busink, *Tempel,* I, 618ff.

30:19; 31:9; Amos 1:2 [par. Joel 4:16(3:16)]; Mic. 3:10; Zech. 1:14, etc.; cf. also Ps. 76:3[2]: *šālēm;* [Isa. 64:9(10)]; 4Q504 1-2, IV, 12: *'îr qōdeš*).

As long as the settlement was concentrated on the southeast hill during the Persian period, and as long as the preexilic area of the city on the southwest hill was not rebuilt after its destruction by the Babylonians, the parallel between *ṣîyôn* and Jerusalem could be understood as an identification of the two.[48] With the renewed expansion of the settlement to the southwest hill,[49] passages with a syndetic association (Isa. 10:12; 24:23; Zech. 1:14, etc.) could be understood as differentiating *ṣîyôn* as a specific part of Jerusalem.

Zech. 8:3 distinguishes *ṣîyôn bᵉṯôḵ yᵉrûšālāyim* from the city itself. This passage frames *yᵉrûšālāyim 'îr hā'ᵉmeṯ* with *ṣîyôn* and *har yhwh ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ har haqqōḏeš.* Mic. 4:8 develops topographically concentric circles extending from a tower or gate *(migdal 'ēḏer)* of the destroyed palace, to the *'ōpel* (cf. 2 Ch. 27:3; 33:14; Neh. 3:26-27; Isa. 32:14) as a hill on which the Solomonic palace stood,[50] to *ṣîyôn* on the southeast hill, and on out to the entire city of Jerusalem. A. S. van der Woude, however, identifies *migdal 'ēḏer* with *'ōpel* as the "citadel" and *baṯ ṣîyôn* with *baṯ yᵉrûšālāyim.*[51] Any interpretation here depends on one's understanding of the history of construction in Jerusalem.

In Isa. 1:8; 10:32; Jer. 4:31; 6:2,23 (all preexilic), the expression *baṯ-ṣîyôn* comes to personify Jerusalem and its inhabitants.[52] The personification of cities as *baṯ* was a common practice in Israel.[53] Jer. 4:30-31 (cf. 6:2,23), however, associates negative connotations with this expression in its reference to Jerusalem as an unfaithful harlot now at the mercy of her enemies. Exilic and postexilic personifications of Jerusalem as *baṯ-ṣîyôn* include 2 K. 19:21; Ps. 9:15(14); Isa. 16:1; 37:22; 62:11; Lam. 1:6; 2:1,4,8,10,13,18; 4:22; Mic. 1:13; 4:8,10,13; Zech. 2:14(10). Isa. 52:2 identifies *baṯ-ṣîyôn* with *yᵉrûšālāyim,* Zeph. 3:14 and Zech. 9:9 with *baṯ yᵉrûšālāyim.* The expressions *ḥômaṯ baṯ-ṣîyôn* (Lam. 2:8,18) and *ša'ᵃrê baṯ-ṣîyôn* (Ps. 9:15[14]) are personifications of Jerusalem referring to the southeast hill as identified in Isa. 10:32 (*Q,* versions) and 16:1 in the expression *har baṯ-ṣîyôn* and in 10:32 with *giḇ'aṯ yᵉrûšālāyim.* The expression *bᵉṯûlaṯ baṯ-ṣîyôn* (2 K. 19:21 par.; Lam. 2:13) represents an emphatic personification.

The identification of *ṣîyôn* with *yᵉrûšālāyim* is also implied in references to Jerusalem's inhabitants that use *ṣîyôn* in the preexilic combination *bᵉnôṯ ṣîyôn* (Isa. 3:16) and in the exilic/postexilic combinations *('ammî) yôšēḇ ṣîyôn* (Isa. 10:24; Ps. 9:12[11]; cf. Isa. 51:16), *yôšeḇeṯ ṣîyôn* (Isa. 12:6; Jer. 51:35; cf. Zech. 2:11), *bᵉnê ṣîyôn* (Ps. 149:2; Lam. 4:2; Joel 2:23), and *hoi pároikoi Siṓn* (Bar. 4:9,14,24).[54]

---

48. Concerning Jerusalem during the Persian period, see Otto, *Jerusalem,* 94ff.; Oeming, 189ff.

49. Avigad, 64-80.

50. Dalman, *Jerusalem,* 125.

51. *Micha. POT* (1976), 146.

52. → בַּת *baṯ (bath),* II, 332ff.

53. Fitzgerald, *CBQ* 37 (1975) 167-83, understands the term as a reference to a "capital city." Concerning a possible mythological background to such personification, see Fitzgerald, *CBQ* 34 (1972) 403-16.

54. Concerning Ps. 126:1, *šîḇaṯ ṣîyôn,* "reestablishment," see *KAI,* no. 224; II, 265, 270-71.

The identification of *ṣîyôn* with the southeast hill as the temple mount and with the city Jerusalem presented no problems as long as during the Persian and early Hellenistic period the city settlement itself, encompassed by the wall of Nehemiah,[55] remained restricted to the southeast hill. This identification of *ṣîyôn* with the city itself, however, became problematic once the settlement expanded to the southwest hill during the Hasmonean period in the late 2d century B.C.E.[56] and to the northwest hill during the Herodian period.[57] 1 Maccabees (4:37,60; 5:54; 6:48,62; 7:33; 10:11; 14:26; cf. Jth. 9:13) consistently identifies *Siṓn* in combination with *óros* with the southeast hill. The *óros Siṓn* is distinguished from the *pólis Dauid,* which as the acropolis is identified as the *ákra* (1 Mc. 1:33; 7:33; 14:36).[58] The differentiation between *teíchē* and *óros Siṓn* in 1 Mc. 10:11 suggests the presence of fortifications extending beyond the southeast hill.

By the early 4th century C.E., the name Zion was firmly associated with the southwest hill such that David's palace and grave were also thought to be located there.[59] Josephus (*Ant.* 7.3 §§61ff.) attests the presumed location of the *pólis Dauid* on the southwest hill as early as the 1st century C.E. Josephus rigorously avoids using the name *Siṓn,* possibly because during the Jewish revolt of 66-70 C.E. *ṣîyôn* came to symbolize Israel's freedom from Roman rule (cf. the coin inscriptions *ḥr(w)t ṣywn,* "Zion's freedom," and *lg'lt ṣywn,* "for the liberation of Zion"[60]). Given the intimate association of *ṣîyôn* and the temple, this transference to the southwest hill was not really possible before Titus destroyed the temple itself, though it was certainly anticipated by the preceding presumption that the pre-Israelite fortress and city of David were located on the southwest hill.

IV. Preexilic *ṣîyôn* Theology.

1. *Zion Texts in Proto-Isaiah and Micah.* Interest in prophetic exegesis has shifted from trying to reconstruct the prophets' proclamation by distinguishing between authentic and inauthentic prophetic material to attempting to understand the literary and theological history of how exilic and postexilic circles of transmission expressed their self-interpretation in the medium of the prophetic tradition. On the basis of a considerable corpus of authentic Isaianic material, H. Wildberger has reconstructed an Isaianic theology in which pronouncements of both salvation and doom stand in tension beside one another.[61] This reconstruction is countered by O. Kaiser's attempt to explain the book of Proto-Isaiah, whose corpus in Isa. 1* and 28–31* was not committed to writing until the 6th century, from the perspective of postexilic Israel's own attempt to come to terms with the reality of the exile.[62] Other scholars provide a mediating posi-

55. Concerning the course of the wall, see Otto, *Jerusalem,* 102-8.

56. Kenyon, *Digging Up Jerusalem,* 192-93; Shiloh, *Excavations,* 30.

57. Otto, *Jerusalem,* 122ff., 153ff.

58. Ibid., 115-19.

59. See, among others, *Itinerarium Burdigalense,* XVI, 88-90 (Eng. *Itinerary from Bordeaux to Jerusalem* [London, 1896]).

60. Y. Meshorer, *Jewish Coins of the Second Temple Period* (Tel Aviv, 1967), 154-58.

61. Wildberger, *Jesaja (28–39),* 1646ff.; cf. Hermisson, 54ff.

62. *Isaiah 1–12. OTL* (Eng. trans. ^{2}1983), 1ff.; idem, *Isaiah 13–39. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1974), 234ff.; idem, *TRE,* XVI, 644ff.

tion with two different points of accentuation. Barth[63] adduces a proclamation of salvation from Isaiah bound to the notion of judgment that was then expanded during the preexilic period as a pure proclamation of salvation in the oracles to Assyria and the nations.[64] Werner and Kilian differentiate between the Isaianic tradition as a pure proclamation of doom whose hermeneutical key is found in Isa. 6, and the exilic-postexilic redaction to which one then ascribes all the traditions of salvation influenced by the Zion theology.[65]

Indisputably post-Isaianic material includes the oracles of salvation influenced by Zion theology in 1:27-28; 4:2-6; 10:12,24-27a; 18:7; 29:8; 33:1-6,7-16,17-24; 35:1-10. The command to close the people's ears and eyes in Isa. 6 is the key to answering the question of the authenticity of the remaining Zion traditions. If Isa. 6 is genuinely the hermeneutical key to Isaiah's proclamation, a proclamation through which judgment is already being implemented in that it obstructs any hope for deliverance,[66] then one cannot ascribe any oracles of salvation and repentance to Isaiah himself. The contradiction with the positive tone in 7:9b,11[67] shows that this distribution of aspects of doom or salvation is an oversimplification. If Isa. 6 as a call narrative represents a summary of Isaiah's own ineffectiveness during the Syro-Ephraimite War, then one would expect, as is the case with the prophets Hosea and Jeremiah, Isaiah's proclamation to become increasingly dark to the point of being a pure proclamation of doom after the Syro-Ephraimite War. One can ascribe to Isaiah the negative alteration of elements of Zion theology in the oracles of disaster in 1:4-9,21-26(a); 3:16-17; 8:5-8,11-15,18; 10:27b-32; 28:16-17; 29:1-4; 31:1,(2),3,4 and 7:1-17*. By contrast, the oracles of salvation involving the "nations" in 8:9-10; 14:24-27,32; 17:12-14; 29:5-7; 31:5,8-9, which address the postexilic motifs of the battle of nations and of "help before/at morning," represent secondary expansions. Dating these passages to the time of Josiah[68] leads to the improbable conclusion that even after the defeat and retreat of Assyria one expected a (second) defeat of Assyria (14:24-27) and the nations (17:12-14) before the city. Rather, a post-Isaianic stratum of proclamations of doom against Assyria dating to the 7th century (10:5-8[13-15]; 29:5-7; 30:27-33) was expanded during the postexilic period within an interpretive stratum of salvation oracles for Jerusalem influenced by the motif of the battle of the nations and found in 8:9-10; 10:12,24-27a; 14:24-27,32; 17:12-14; 29:8; 31:5,8-9; 33:1-6. Later redactional material counters with the expectation of a peaceful gathering of the nations at Zion (2:2-4; 18:7) and adds to the stratum of the battle of nations and unconditional salvation elements assessing Israel's own guilt (1:27ff.; 4:2-6; 33:7-10).[69]

---

63. Barth, 49ff.

64. See also Clements, *Isaiah and Deliverance;* Vermeylen, II, 678ff.

65. Kilian, *Jesaja 1–39,* 40-97.

66. R. Kilian, *Jesaja 1–12. NEB* 17 (1986), 49.

67. See C. Dohmen, review of Kilian, *Jesaja 1–39,* in *Bibl* 68 (1987) 588.

68. Barth, 239ff.

69. Concerning Isa. 35:1-10, see O. H. Steck, *Bereitete Heimkehr: Jesaja 35 als redaktionelle Brücke zwischen dem Ersten und dem Zweiten Jesaja. SBS* 121 (1985).

presence on *ṣîyôn* (1 K. 8:12-13 [MT]; Ps. 24:3; 47:9[8]; 93:5, etc.) together with the notion that Yahweh dwells (*škn bᵉ[har] ṣîyôn,* Isa. 8:18; Joel 4:17,21[3:17,21]; cf. Ps. 135:21)[82] and has his throne (*yšb ṣîyôn,* Ps. 9:12[11]; cf. 132:13) on *ṣîyôn* as the *har qoḏšô* (2:6 [vv. 1-4,6-9 are preexilic];[83] 48:2[1]; cf. 3:5[4]; 15:1) and as the *har yhwh* (24:3; concerning Yahweh's throne, cf., e.g., also 47:9[8]). Both the throne motif associated with the ark (9:12[11]; 68:17[16], etc.)[84] and the motif of the temple as Yahweh's dwelling (e.g., 46:5-6[4-5]) are now transferred to *ṣîyôn.* As the *ʿîr "yhwh"* now, *ṣîyôn qᵉḏōš* is also the *miškᵉnê ʿelyôn* (46:5[4]) in whose midst *(bᵉqirbâ)* Yahweh can be found (v. 6a[5a]). The understanding of the temple as the locus of mediation between heaven and earth[85] combines the notion that Yahweh is enthroned in heaven (20:7[6], *šᵉmê qoḏšô;* 2:4, *yôšēḇ baššamayim*) and yet also dwells on *ṣîyôn* (2:6; 20:3[2]; 47:9[8], etc.; concerning the postexilic association of the idea that Yahweh dwells both in heaven and on the mount of God, see Isa. 14:13[86]). The God who is king on *ṣîyôn* rules over the gods (Ps. 29:1-2;[87] 47:7[88]), the nations (47:2,4,10[1,3,9] [*ʿammîm;* cf. *gôyim* in v. 9(8)]),[89] on Israel's behalf (46:7-8[6-7]),[90] and over the world (47:3[2], *meleḵ gāḏôl ʿal-kol-hāʾāreṣ;* cf. 24:1; 47:8[7]; 48:11[10]).[91]

Historically the roots of this theology of presence associated with the Jerusalem temple are actually found in the Shilonite ark theology,[92] which already exhibits features of "integrative monolatry" (Hossfeld). In the preexilic autumnal festival in Jerusalem,[93] the motif of enthronement (Ps. 47:9[8], *mālaḵ "yhwh" yāšaḇ ʿal-kissēʾ qoḏšô*) evoked for contemporary participants how Yahweh took possession of the *har ṣîyôn* through David's transferal of the ark, which in its own turn was already closely associated with the idea of Yahweh's throne (2 S. 6:12ff.;[94] Ps. 47:6[5], *ʿālâ "yhwh";* cf. also Ps. 68:25[24]).[95]

---

82. See Mettinger, *Dethronement,* 90-97; cf. M. Dietrich, O. Loretz, and J. Sanmartín, "*KUNŠ* und *ŠKN* im Ugaritischen," *UF* 6 (1974) 47-53.

83. A different view is taken by E. Zenger, "Wozu tosen die Völker: Beobachtungen zur Entstehung und Theologie des 2. Psalms," *FS H. Gross,* 495-511, who dates them to the postexilic period.

84. Jörg Jeremias, *Königtum Gottes,* 167-82.

85. Metzger, *UF* 2 (1970) 139-58; cf. Ahlström, "Heaven on Earth."

86. Also Stolz, *Strukturen,* 164-65.

87. Concerning the El motif, see Jörg Jeremias, *Königtum Gottes,* 34-35, contra Kloos, 15-37.

88. Roberts, *BASOR* 221 (1976) 130-31; T. N. D. Mettinger, review of Jörg Jeremias, *Königtum Gottes,* in *VT* 38 (1988) 238.

89. See Jörg Jeremias, *Königtum Gottes,* 66 n. 26.

90. Steck, *Friedensvorstellungen,* 15-16 n. 16; Caquot, 315-16; Roberts, *BASOR* 221 (1976) 131-32.

91. Saggs, 153-88.

92. Eiler; Otto, *TZ* 32 (1976) 65-77.

93. Otto, *TRE,* XI, 100-101 (with bibliog.).

94. Metzger, *Königsthron und Gottesthron.* See J. M. de Tarragon, *Le culte à Ugarit d'après les textes de la pratique en cunéiformes alphabétiques. CahRB* 19 (1980), 98ff.

95. See also *KTU* 1.6, I, 56-59, 62; 1.10, III, 12-15. For an analysis of the structure of Ps. 47, see Otto and Schramm, *Festival and Joy,* 59-65; continued by Jörg Jeremias, *Königtum Gottes,* 50-59.

The universal significance of the *har ṣîyôn* for the world as the throne of God the King[96] is underscored by mythical motifs associated with *ṣîyôn*[97] as well as by temple architecture and iconography.[98] Ps. 46:5(4)[99] (cf. Isa. 33:21) uses the expression *nāhār pᵉlāḡāyw yᵉśammᵉḥû ʿîr "yhwh"* in adopting a motif involving El's divine dwelling.[100]

The motif of Baʿal's dwelling place on *ṣāp̄ôn* (Ps. 48:3[2]; Isa. 14:13)[101] did not enter the Zion texts until the exilic period at the earliest, and thus cannot support the thesis that a Davidic "Zion tradition" developed as an ideological conglomerate of disparate Canaanite mythologoumena.[102] The idea of a tent as the divine dwelling (*miškān*, Ps. 46:5[4]; cf. also Ps. 26:8; 43:3; Isa. 54:2; Ezk. 37:27, etc.)[103] is also associated with El.[104] The sheer size of the Adyton in the Jerusalem temple transcends all known dimensions of the typical temple in Syria-Palestine.[105] As such, those dimensions express its universal significance as the divine seat whether 1 K. 6:2-3 preserves the actual dimensions of the temple or whether later historical fiction is using those dimensions to underscore the significance of the temple itself. The temple's furnishings similarly use the symbolism of dominion associated with the ark and cherubim[106] and with the tree of life and lotus blossom[107] to support the claim to universal life sustenance.[108]

The anticipated benefits of Yahweh's presence on *ṣîyôn* include especially protection (*maḥᵃseh wāʿōz*, Ps. 46:2[1]; *miśgāḇ*, 46:8[7]) and aid (*ʿezrâ bᵉṣārôṯ*, 46:2[1][109]) for the city and its inhabitants: *"yhwh" bᵉqirḇâ bal-timmôṭ* (46:6[5]). The central focus of this theology is the security of *ṣîyôn* in Jerusalem and in a wider circle of daughter cities (*bᵉnôṯ yᵉhûḏâ*, 48:12[11]) against foreign nations (46:7[6]). This concern comes to expression in the motif of Yahweh's superiority over *nᵉhārôṯ* and *mayim rabbîm*, which Ps. 93 antithetically juxtaposes with the royal God Yahweh.[110] As king, Yahweh

---

96. See Buccellati, *FS Oppenheim.*

97. Clifford, *Cosmic Mountain,* 131ff.

98. Busink, I, 162ff.

99. See A. Cooper, *RSP,* III, 376-77.

100. Hillmann, 163 n. 4; *il mbk nhrm bʿdt thmtm, KTU* 1.100.3; cf. also *KTU* 1.6, I, 33; 1.4, IV, 21, etc.; Clifford, *Cosmic Mountain,* 48-51; Gese, in Gese, et al., *Die Religion Altsyriens, Altarabiens und der Mandäer. RM* X/2 (1970), 98. Concerning Hurrite pars., see Haas, *Hethitische Berggötter,* 142-48; idem, *Vorzeitmythen,* 14-21.

101. W. H. Schmidt, *Königtum Gottes,* 32-35; → צפון *ṣāp̄ôn.*

102. Contra Roberts, *JBL* 92 (1973) 332-36.

103. Schreiner, 89ff. Concerning the influence of the tent motif on the first temple, see Busink, I, 600ff.; Ottosson, *Temples and Cult Places,* 112.

104. Clifford, *Cosmic Mountain,* 54.

105. See the survey in Ottosson, *Temples and Cult Places,* 116-17; also Fritz, *Tempel und Zelt,* 27-35.

106. See Metzger, "Der Thron als Manifestation."

107. S. Schoer, *In Israel gab es Bilder. OBO* 74 (1987), 46-66.

108. Concerning the association of temple and creation, see Levenson, *JR* 64 (1984) 285-91 (with bibliog.); Metzger, *ZDPV* 99 (1983) 54-94; J. Strange, "The Idea of Afterlife in Ancient Israel," *PEQ* 117 (1985) 35-40.

109. → צר *ṣar* I.

110. Otto, *FS Kraus,* 58-60; idem, *BN* 42 (1988) 97-99; Jörg Jeremias, *Königtum Gottes,* 16-17.

is enthroned over the hostile waters (29:10, *mabbûl*[111]) and establishes the *tēḇēl* above the *yammîm* and *nᵉhārôṯ* (24:1-2).[112] Ps. 46:7(6) historicizes the chaos motif in vv. 3-4(2-3) by using the pars. *yehᵉmû mêmāyw* and *hāmû gôyim* on the one hand, and *bᵉmôṭ hārîm* and *māṭû mamlāḵôṯ* on the other with regard to Jerusalem's security.[113] The superiority of God the King over the hostile powers is evident in his establishment of the earth itself and comes to direct expression in a storm theophany (*nāṯan bᵉqôlô tāmûg 'āreṣ*, 46:7[6])[114] that historicizes motifs that in Ugarit were associated with the kingship of Ba'al.[115] The psalm also adds the original *šmš* motif of "help before/at morning" (46:6[5], *ya'zᵉrehā "yhwh" lipnôṯ bōqer*),[116] which Stolz[117] associates with the pre-Israelite city god *(šḥr-) šlm*.[118] This motif was more likely adopted during the intrusion of *šmš* motifs in Jerusalem during the Assyrian period (2 K. 23:5,11; Jer. 8:2; Ezk. 8:16-18).[119] This motif of victory over the nations developed out of the historical treatment of the mythical battle with chaos and its association with theophany and *šmš* motifs. Although the motif did indeed undergo further development during the postexilic period, its preexilic version cannot yet really be called a motif involving the "battle of the nations," since it mentions neither an assembly of nations against the city nor Yahweh's annihilation of that assembly before the city. Although *ṣîyôn* represents the place from which help emanates in the preexilic tradition (Ps. 20:3[2]), it is not yet the site of a battle of the nations. Preexilic Zion theology focuses on establishing Jerusalem's security, and the city's fortifications come to express Yahweh's visible superiority over all political threats (Ps. 48:13-15a[12-14a]).[120]

Because it is not possible to sort out in Ps. 46 the various traditions that in Ugarit were associated with El and Ba'al, these motifs may already have been combined during the pre-Israelite stage and were passed down as such.[121] By contrast, Kloos believes that Yahweh originally exhibited characteristics of Ba'al within a larger El pantheon, in which case the El characteristics associated with Yahweh would be secondary.[122] The history of transmission of Zion theology from the exilic period, however, exhibits an increasing integration of the motif of the battle of chaos associated with Ba'al. Although the focus of

---

111. Kloos, 61-93.

112. Day, 37-38.

113. Day, 120-21.

114. Cf. *KTU* 1.4, VII, 29-35; *ANET,* 134a; *KTU* 1.101, 1-4, etc.

115. *KTU* 1.2 et passim; *ANET,* 130. Cf. Caquot, *DBS,* IX, 1373-75.

116. Stähli, *Solare Elemente im Jahweglauben des ATs. OBO* 66 (1985) 38; Janowski, *Rettungsgewissheit und Epiphanie.*

117. *Strukturen,* 214-15.

118. *KTU* 1.23; Caquot, *DBS,* IX, 1367-71 (with bibliog.); *yᵉrûšālēm/ᴵᵁᴿᵁ*ᐟ*u-ru-ša-lim;* cf. Otto, *RLA,* V, 279. → ירושלים *yᵉrûšālēm/yᵉrûšālayim,* VI, 347ff.

119. See H. Spieckermann, *Juda unter Assur in der Sargonidenzeit. FRLANT* 129 (1982), 229-372; cf. also the equine figures with solar disks from Jerusalem, and in this regard Schroer, *In Israel gab es Bilder,* 293-300.

120. Concerning the cultic context of the summons *sōbbû ṣîyôn,* see Otto and Schramm, *Festival and Joy,* 65-66.

121. Stolz, *Strukturen,* 152-57; cf. Lemche, 224-31.

122. Kloos, 123-24.

preexilic Zion theology is the security of Jerusalem, this focus probably did not develop and was not fostered as an ideology associated with the high kingdoms of David and Solomon;[123] it more likely emerged as a specific version of traditional temple theology after the collapse of the kingdom especially in the 8th century (cf. 1 K. 8:12-13; Ps. 29; 47; 93) and with the incorporation of motifs that functioned similarly during the pre-Israelite period in connection with the city's security in times of political threat.[124]

A second circle of motifs associated with Yahweh's presence on *ṣîyôn* integrates the notion of *ḥeseḏ, ṣeḏeq,* and *mišpāṭ* into Zion theology (Ps. 48:10-12[9-11]).[125] On this view *ṣeḏeq* fills *(ml')* Yahweh's hand on *ṣîyôn* (48:11[10]), and the *mišpaṭ yhwh* makes *ṣîyôn* rejoice (48:12[11]; cf. Isa. 1:21,[26b][126]). Just as in Ps. 24:5 the motif of God's help, *yhwh gibbôr milḥāmâ* (v. 8), in its association with the city can be individualized as *'ᵉlōhê yišʿô,* so also the ascription of *ṣᵉdāqâ* that an individual receives in the cultic blessing (*yiśśā' bᵉrāḵâ mē'ēṯ yhwh ûṣᵉḏāqâ mē'ᵉlōhê yišʿô,* 24:5).[127] The concepts of *bᵉrāḵâ* and *ṣᵉḏāqâ* are bound to normative behavior that includes solidarity with the weaker members of society (15:3-5aβ; 24:4aβ-b; cf. Ex. 22:20aα,22,24-26).[128] Ps. 15:5 (*ʿōśēh-'ēlleh lō' yimmôṭ lᵉʿôlām*) individualizes the motif of protecting the world from the waters of chaos (*tikkôn tēḇēl bal-timmôṭ,* Ps. 93:1, etc.) in a fashion corresponding to the individualization of the motif of help and applies it to the individual who behaves normatively (cf. also 125:1).

Prophetic criticism measures Zion theology against these ethical demands and rejects its claim to establish the city's security theologically. Such criticism finds that justice is perverted,[129] the upper classes corrupt (Isa. 1:23; Mic. 3:11, etc.), and *ṣîyôn* built with *dāmîm* instead of with *mišpāṭ* and *ṣᵉḏāqâ* (Mic. 3:10; Hab. 2:12).[130] Although the expectations that Zion theology entertains regarding the security of *ṣîyôn* may indeed be fulfilled, Isaiah makes this fulfillment dependent on the inhabitants' own *'ᵉmûnâ* (Isa. 1:21,[26]; 28:16; cf. 7:9b). Unfortunately, the city has failed that test (28:16).[131] Isaiah provocatively reverses Zion theology in anticipating how Yahweh will turn against *ṣîyôn* to avenge injustice (1:24, *'innāqᵉmâ*). By contrast, in his early

---

123. Roberts, *JBL* 92 (1973) 329-44.

124. Otto, *VT* 30 (1980) 316-29.

125. See Porteous, *FS W. Rudolph,* 239-41; also Lach.

126. See Niehr, 71.

127. Otto, *ZAW* 98 (1986) 166; a different view is taken by D. Dombkowski, "Psalm 15 and 24" (diss., Vanderbilt, 1984), who dates Ps. 15 and 24 to the prestate period.

128. E. Otto, *Wandel der Rechtsbegründungen in der Gesellschaftsgeschichte des antiken Israel. Studia Biblica* 3 (1988) 38-44; cf. the differing literary conclusions regarding strata in Ps. 15 and 24 in Beyerlin, *Heilsordnung,* 9; Steingrimsson; see in this regard Otto, *Wandel,* 89 n. 161.

129. Concerning the history of this legal context, see Bazak, "Judicial Ethics in Jewish Law," *Oxford Conference Volume 1984. Jewish Law Association Studies* 3 (1987) 30-31; E. Otto, "Interdependenzen zwischen Geschichte und Rechtsgeschichte des antiken Israels," *Rechtshistorisches Journal* 7 (1988) 358ff.

130. E. Otto, "Die Stellung der Wehe-Worte in der Verkündigung des Propheten Habakuk," *ZAW* 89 (1977) 83-84; concerning the legal and sociohistorical background, see Dietrich, 37-44; Niehr.

131. Kilian, 62.

proclamation Isaiah announces a judgment of purification that will destroy only the upper classes and thus make it possible to renew Jerusalem as the *'îr haṣṣeḏeq qiryâ ne'emānâ* (Isa. 1:26). Later he anticipates only the destruction of Jerusalem (e.g., 32:14). Indeed, Yahweh himself will lead Jerusalem's enemies against the city and fight against *ṣîyôn* (8:5-8,11-15,18; 10:27b-32; 28:16-17; 29:1-4; 31:1,[2],3-4). Here Isaiah resembles the rural Judean prophet Micah, who predicted that *ṣîyôn* would be turned into a field (Mic. 3:10-12).[132] As Zion theology, priestly temple theology positively assesses the Assyrian danger for Jerusalem, underscoring through various mythical motifs the safety of *ṣîyôn* that precedes all experiential reality. By contrast, Isaiah and Micah criticize this positive position in a parallel fashion[133] by measuring Zion theology against its own unfulfilled ethical claims. Of course, the deliverance of Jerusalem from destruction by Sennacherib[134] doubtless provided a considerable lift for Zion theology. Indeed, during the Josianic period the affirmative thrust of Zion theology seems to have been demonstrated once and for all by the collapse of Assyria itself, and during precisely this period Zion theology shaped the reception of Isaianic traditions by announcing how the destruction of Assyria begins on *ṣîyôn* (Isa. 10:5-8,13-15; 29:5-7; 30:27-33).

After Josiah's death, Jeremiah updates the announcement of disaster against *ṣîyôn* by anticipating the Neo-Babylonian "enemy from the north" (Jer. 4:3–6:30).[135] Jeremiah initially believes that the imminent danger can yet be thwarted by a change of behavior and attitude, especially on the part of the upper classes (5:5; cf. 4:3,14; 5:1; 6:8); later, however, he sees that Jerusalem society is irretrievably perverted (6:30) and that *ṣîyôn* can no longer be delivered from the enemy (4:6,31; 6:2-3,23). In the Babylonian siege of Jerusalem, Jeremiah believes that survival is possible only by renouncing the belief that Yahweh's presence insures the safety of Jerusalem (15:5-6)[136] and by voluntarily taking the path of suffering into exile (21:9; 38:2).

Ezekiel rejects Jerusalem as *'îr haddāmmîm* (Ezk. 22:2-3; 24:6; cf. 16:3ff.) and avoids using the designation *ṣîyôn* altogether by circumscribing it as *har merôm yiśrā'ēl* (17:23; cf. 34:14).[137] Every political action drawing impetus from God's presence and from the attendant belief in the city's security will produce the opposite results of those envisioned (Ezk. 4–5,[138] 8–11*[139]).

---

132. See J. M. Vincent, 169-79.

133. See in this regard Neve.

134. See R. Liwak, "Die Rettung Jerusalems im Jahr 701 vor Christus," *ZTK* 83 (1986) 137-66.

135. See R. Albertz, "Jer 2–6 und die Frühzeitverkündigung Jeremias," *ZAW* 94 (1982) 20-47.

136. → עִיר *'îr* XI, 63-64 (IV.3).

137. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), 417.

138. C. Uehlinger, "Zeichne eine Stadt — und belagere sie: Bild und Wort in einer Zeichenhandlung Ezechiels gegen Jerusalem," in M. Küchler and C. Uehlinger, eds., *Jerusalem. Texte — Bilder — Steine. FS H. und O. Keel-Leu, Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus* 6 (1987), 111-200.

139. F.-L. Hossfeld, "Die Tempelvision Ez. 8–11 im Licht unterschiedlicher methodischer Zugänge," in J. Lust, ed., *Ezekiel and His Book: Textual and Literary Criticism and Their Interrelation. BETL* 74 (1986), 151-65.

V. Exilic, Postexilic, and Early Jewish *ṣîyôn* Theology.

1. *ṣîyôn Theology and the Destruction of the Temple.* The exile and the destruction of the temple inaugurate a new stage in ancient Israelite reflection. This reflection is theological in the strict sense in that it must deal seriously with the fundamental contradiction between God's reality on the one hand and concrete experience on the other. The destruction of the city and temple in Jerusalem exposes the emptiness of the claim made by preexilic Zion theology that God's presence on Zion guarantees the security of both the city and the mount of God. The lament on the preexilic period already leads to modifications in the understanding of God's presence on *ṣîyôn*. The preexilic identification of *ṣîyôn* with Yahweh's throne is now differentiated by its identification with *hᵃḏōm raglāyw (yhwh)* (Lam. 2:1; cf. Ps. 99:5,9; Isa. 60:13).[140] Lam. 5:18-19 (MT) juxtaposes the *har ṣîyôn šeššāmēm* with the stability of God's throne in heaven, and this distinction now lends an element of necessity to the supplication for relief (Lam. 5:20-22; cf. Ps. 102:13-14,20[12-13,19]). Lam. 2:1 expresses the present remoteness of *yhwh* from *ṣîyôn* in the metaphor of being cast out of heaven. In a contrast between "then and now," a contrast actually deriving from the lament of the people[141] and now looking beyond preexilic assertions concerning stability and security, *ṣîyôn* becomes in retrospect the *tip'ereṯ yiśrā'ēl* (cf. also Lam. 2:15; Isa. 46:13), and its national significance for Israel conceptually articulated. Lam. 2:1 and 5:19 contribute to an (early post-) exilic modification of that preexilic *ṣîyôn* theology.

In 1 K. 8:(27),31-51,[142] late Dtr theology corrects the preexilic theology of presence in 1 K. 8:12-13 (MT) by distinguishing between heaven as Yahweh's dwelling (cf. also Ps. 33:13-14; 102:20[19]; Isa. 33:5, etc.)[143] and the temple as the locus of the presence of the *šēm yhwh*,[144] albeit not without adding a note (1 K. 8:29-30,52-53,59-60) concerning the element of Yahweh's proximity attaching to this presence. The corrective of preexilic temple theology also includes the longer forms of the centralization formula,[145] which are secondarily summarized in the shorter version[146] and actually represent a Dtr development of a preexilic Jerusalem version of Ex. 20:24a(α)β-b.[147] This differentiation between Yahweh's dwelling in heaven and in the temple (1 K. 8:48-49) makes it possible to hope for a turn of fate even after the loss of both the land and the temple (1 K. 8:50-51). As in Ezekiel and the Dtr History, the name *ṣîyôn* is avoided, and is used only in nontheological contexts in 2 S. 5:7 and 1 K. 8:1 and only in citations in 2 K. 19:21,31. Post-Dtr authors correct this position by identifying *ṣîyôn* with Yahweh's throne anew (Jer. 3:16-17). In Ezk. 43:1-11,(12), Priestly *kāḇôḏ* theology[148] anticipates that the *kᵉḇôḏ*

---

140. → הדם *hᵃḏōm (hᵃdhōm)*, III, 325-34.

141. C. Westermann, "The Re-presentation of History in the Psalms," *Praise and Lament in the Psalms* (Eng. trans. 1981), 215-20.

142. Veijola, 150ff.

143. See M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* (Oxford, 1972), 193-98.

144. Mettinger, *Dethronement*, 38-52.

145. Documentation in Weippert, 93.

146. Lohfink, 326.

147. Otto, *Wandel*, 55-56.

148. → כבוד *kāḇôḏ*, VII, 22-38.

yhwh will dwell on the mount of God as the *mᵉqôm kisᵉʾî* and *mᵉqôm kappôṯ raḡlay* (Ezk. 43:7);[149] in articulating this expectation, this theology modifies the preexilic Zion theology by mediating in a fashion resembling the late Dtr *šēm* theology between the possibility of Yahweh's remoteness and his nearness. Exilic theology then articulates the national significance of the mount of God in the motif of Yahweh's self-attachment to Israel as manifested in Yahweh's presence on the mount in the midst of the Israelites (1 K. 6:11-13; Ps. 78:60; Ezk. 43:7,9; cf. Ex. 24:16; 25:8; 29:45-46 [P^G]).[150]

Whereas preexilic prophecy judges Zion theology against its own ethical claims, Dtr theology establishes normative behavior as the presupposition of the salvific expectations connected to Yahweh's self-attachment to the mount of God (Jer. 7:3ff.; 1 K. 6:12-13). The hope that Yahweh will attach himself to *ṣîyôn* once and for all also adheres to this presupposition, anticipating that Yahweh himself will make such normative behavior possible in Israel (1 K. 8:57-58; Jer. 31:18,32-33; Lam. 5:21; Ezk. 43:7-9). The Dtr tradition believes that God's salvific will does transcend the destruction of *ṣîyôn,* the presuppositions being that he overcomes his wrath in remorse (Ex. 32:12,14;[151] Jer. 26:3,13,19; 42:10[152]) and that Israel repents (e.g., 1 K. 8:47-48). Lam. 3:22-23 commensurately refers to Yahweh's *ḥᵃsāḏîm, raḥᵃmîm,* and *ʾᵉmûnâ,* which transcend his anger (cf. Jer. 31:20).

Whereas Ezekiel believes the divine salvific will must remain a mystery (Ezk. 37:6,13a), Deutero-Ezekielian and late Deutero-Isaianic authors focus instead on the holiness of Yahweh and of his name (Isa. 41:14,20; 48:9; Ezk. 36:16-32, etc.). Isa. 49:16 concentrates Yahweh's resolute loyalty in the image of Yahweh inscribing *ṣîyôn* on his hand, a motif complex subsequently expanded with the idea that the sufferings of the exile also serve as atonement (Isa. 40:2; 52:13–53:12). Isa. 49:1–52:12 (52:13–55:13) adds the complementary element of Zion theology to the exilic traditions in Isa. 40–48 centered on the exodus from exile.[153] The *mᵉḇaśśēr* announces the revelation of God's royal dominion over the nations, a dominion now manifest in his return to *ṣîyôn* (52:7-10; cf. Zech. 2:14[10]; 8:3) and insuring the *šālôm* against the onslaught of the waters of chaos (Isa. 51:9–52:2*). This stratum may be the first to combine Zion theology with the exodus traditions.[154] Yahweh's *kāḇôḏ* (40:5; cf. 60:2; Ps. 102:17[16]) is revealed in the return of the exiles (Isa. 40:10-11; 51:11; cf. Jer. 3:14; 31:10-14; Mic. 4:6-7), and the resettlement of Jerusalem is equated with the victory over the waters of chaos (Isa. 44:26b-28; cf. 49:1-21; Mic. 4:7). The new assertion is that *ṣîyôn* as *ʿîr haqqōḏeš* (Zech. 8:3: *ʿîr hāʾᵉmeṯ wᵉhar yhwh ṣᵉḇāʾôṯ har haqqōḏeš*)[155] will be secure

149. Metzger, *UF* 2 (1970) 156.

150. Janowski, *Jahrbuch für biblische Theologie* 2 (1987) 173, 180-86.

151. See C. Dohmen, *Das Bilderverbot: Seine Entstehung und seine Entwicklung im AT. BBB* 62 (1985; ²1987), 66ff.

152. Jörg Jeremias, *Die Reue Gottes. SBS* 65 (1975), 75-87.

153. K. Kiesow, *Exodustexte im Jesajabuch: Literarkritische und motivgeschichtliche Analysen. OBO* 24 (1979), 158ff.

154. Ibid., 198-99.

155. → עיר *ʿîr,* XI, 51-67.

against foreign nations (Isa. 52:1-3). In this sense Yahweh is the *gōʾēl* for *ṣîyôn*. Whereas for Jacob/Israel the notion of *gʾl* is articulated in the relationship between Yahweh as Lord and his slave Jacob/Israel,[156] the redemption of *ṣîyôn*/Jerusalem is expressed in the relationship between Yahweh as the husband and *ṣîyôn*/Jerusalem as his wife and mother (Isa. 44:24; 49:14-15; cf. 66:8; Ps. 87:5 LXX; cf. Isa. 44:21-23; 48:20; 49:26; 52:9; 54:5,8).[157] As the locus of help *(tᵉšûʿâ)* for Israel (Isa. 46:13; cf. 45:17; Ps. 14:7; 53:7[6]; 69:36[35]), *ṣîyôn* comes to designate the exiles themselves (Isa. 46:13; 52:7; cf. Mic. 4:10; Zech. 2:11[7]) and the *ʿam yhwh* (Isa. 51:16).[158] In a parallel development, Jerusalem as *bᵉṯôḵ haggôyim* (Ezk. 5:5) now becomes the tribal center of the new Israel (Ezk. 48).[159]

As part of a theological revolt against the political fate of *ṣîyôn* during the exile, the mythical motifs of the mount (Ezk. 38:12; 40:2; cf. Isa. 2:2; Mic. 4:1; Zech. 14:10) and garden of God (Isa. 51:3; cf. Ezk. 47:1-12; Joel 4:18[3:18]; Zech. 14:8)[160] are enhanced.

2. *ṣîyôn Theology and the Second Temple.* These exilic modifications to Zion theology continue to exert an influence during the postexilic period. In a more highly differentiated fashion than during the preexilic period, the motif of Yahweh's throne in heaven (Ps. 33:13; 74:2; 103:19; 123:1; Isa. 66:1-2) comes to express Yahweh's transcendence, while the motif of Yahweh's dwelling on the mount of God (Joel 2:1; 4:17[3:17]; cf. Ps. 43:3; 84:8[7]; Isa. 56:7; 65:25; 66:20) comes to express his protective proximity. Ps. 74:2 and 7 combine these two aspects by juxtaposing the motifs of the *har ṣîyôn* as the dwelling place of both Yahweh and his name. This notion of Yahweh's remoteness and proximity to *ṣîyôn* is also expressed in the Dtr[161] treatment of several motifs, including election *(bḥr)* (2 Ch. 6:6; 7:12,16; 12:13; Ps. 78:68; 132:13; Zech. 1:17; 2:16[12]), Yahweh's *naḥᵃlâ*[162] (Ex. 15:17;[163] Ps. 74:2; 79:1),[164] his *mᵉnûḥâ* (Ps. 95:11; 132:8 [cf. 2 Ch. 6:41[165]],14; Isa. 66:1; Sir. 36:19[13][166]), and the sanctity of the mount of God (Joel 4:17[3:17]; Ob. 17; Zech. 8:3) and of its inhabitants (Isa. 4:3; 66:20). In contrast to Dt. 12:9,11, and 1 K. 8:56, however, the temple as the locus of *mᵉnûḥâ* is not God's gift to Israel, but rather the place where Yahweh himself rests. On behalf of the transcen-

---

156. K. Baltzer, "Liberation from Debt Slavery after the Exile in Second Isaiah and Nehemiah," *Ancient Israelite Religion. FS F. M. Cross* (Philadelphia, 1987), 477-84.

157. See Schmitt, *RB* 92 (1985) 557-69.

158. Concerning the association of *ṣîyôn* with the idea of the remnant, see J. Hausmann, *Israels Rest: Studien zum Selbstverständnis der nachexilischen Gemeinde. BWANT* 124 (1987), 209ff.

159. Levenson, *Theology of the Program,* 116-22.

160. In this regard see Christensen.

161. Koch, *ZAW* 67 (1955) 205-26, ascribes it to pre-Dtn redaction; but cf. Veijola, 67, 73.

162. F. Horst, "Zwei Begriffe für Eigentum (Besitz)," *Verbannung und Heimkehr. FS W. Rudolph* (Tübingen, 1961), 141.

163. Foresti, 53-54.

164. See *KTU* 1.3, III, 30; IV, 20.

165. See Welten, *FS Würthwein,* 179-82.

166. See G. Braulik, "Gottes Ruhe — Das Land oder das Tempel: Zu Psalm 95,11," *FS H. Gross,* 33-44.

dence of Yahweh as the God who dwells in heaven, Isa. 66:1-2 criticizes these motifs that associate the temple and mount of God with Yahweh's *kissē'*, *hᵃdōm*, or *mᵉnûḥâ* (cf. the counterposition in Hag. 1:8).[167] The motif of revelation from heaven (Jer. 25:30) finds its counterpart in the revelation from *ṣîyôn* (Joel 4:16[3:16]; cf. Am. 1:2).

The direct identification of the mount of God with Jerusalem's southeast hill collapses with the removal of the divine throne to heaven and with the displacement of *ṣîyôn* to the *yarkᵉṯê ṣāpôn* (Ps. 48:3[2]; cf. Isa. 14:13);[168] the motif of the battle with chaos as associated with Ba'al became increasingly prevalent during the exilic period, and the articulation of this displacement of *ṣîyôn* began incorporating motifs associated with Ba'al's mount of God.[169] The visible identification of the southeast hill with the mount of God (Ps. 48:9[8]), like the battle of the nations (48:5-8[4-7]), is displaced to the future. Mic. 4:1 associates the emergence of *ṣîyôn* as the *har bêṯ yhwh* (cf. 2 Ch. 33:15), which is higher than all other mountains, with a new age *(bᵉ'aḥᵃrîṯ hayyāmîm).*

The central preexilic motif was that *ṣîyôn* was protected as a result of Yahweh's own presence there. Postexilic authors then developed this motif into that of the "battle of the nations,"[170] drawing from sources such as the battle with chaos (Ps. 74:13-14; Isa. 17:12-14), the notion of Yahweh as warrior (Ps. 46:7[6]),[171] preexilic Zion theology with its emphasis on the city's security, the preexilic, post-Isaianic oracles of disaster against Assyria (Isa. 10:5-8,[13-15]; 29:5-7; 30:27-33), and finally traditions surrounding the "enemy from the north" (Jer. 4–6; cf. Ezk. 38–39; Joel 2). The new motif complex is grouped around the miraculous rescue from the enemy surrounding *ṣîyôn* (Ps. 48:5-8[4-7]; 76:4-10[3-9]; Isa. 8:9-10; 14:24-27; 17:12-14; 29:8; 31:5,8-9; 33:1-6; Mic. 4:11,12-13). Exilic influence of *šmš* motifs continues in references to "rescue before/at morning" (Isa. 17:12-14; 29:8; 33:2).[172]

In Joel 4(3) and Zech. 12, this battle of the nations picks up motifs associated with eschatological judgment against the nations, in Zech. 14 with motifs associated with preexilic oracles of disaster against Jerusalem and with a judgment of selection in Israel; as such, the overall battle motif exhibits features of an eschatological drama. Ps. 76 associates the battle motif (vv. 5-8[4-7]) with judgment against the nations (vv. 9-10[8-9]) in developing the motif of a destruction of all weapons as the presupposition of universal peace (v. 4[3]). This motif enters Ps. 46:9-12(8-11) as a postexilic updating of vv. 2-8(1-7), turning this psalm into a hymn of eschatological anticipation of Yahweh's universal revelation before the nations at *ṣîyôn* (cf. also Hos. 1:5; 2:20[18];[173] Mic. 5:9-10[10-11]; Zech. 9:10).[174] This motif of smashing weapons and (early post-)exilic mo-

---

167. Hanson, 178 n. 113; a different view is taken by Levenson, *JR* 64 (1984) 293-94.

168. M. C. Astour, *RSP,* II, 318-24; Savignac, 276.

169. W. Herrmann; Hillmann, 10-30; Clifford, *Cosmic Mountain,* 57-79; a different view is taken by N. Wyatt, "Killing and Cosmogony in Canaanite and Biblical Thought," *UF* 17 (1985) 380-81.

170. Wanke, 70-99; a different view is taken by Day, 125-38.

171. See Ollenburger, 101-4.

172. W. Herrmann, "Psalm 19 und der kanaanäische Gott 'Ilu," *UF* 19 (1987) 75-78.

173. Bach, 13-26.

174. Otto, "Dem Krieg gebietet," 16-20.

tifs of an assembly and tribute of the nations at *ṣîyôn* (Ps. 68:29-30[28-29]; 72:10-11; 76:12[11]; 87:2-7; 96:7-9; Isa. 18:7; 19:21; 45:14-15; 49:17; 55:3b-5; Jer. 3:17; Ezk. 17:22-23; Zeph. 3:8-10; Hag. 2:6-9; Zech. 2:15[11]; 6:15; 8:20-22,[23]) together with the establishment of a new system of justice for the nations on *ṣîyôn* (Ps. 99:3-4) coalesce into the opposing motif complex of the "pilgrimage of the nations" (Isa. 2:2-4; Isa. 66:18-23; Mic. 4:1-4,[5]; Zech. 14:16-17) focusing on the motif of the mount of God *ṣîyôn*[175] not only as the pilgrimage goal of the nations, but also as the point from which emanates Yahweh's torah for the nations and his universal world peace.[176] Zech. 14 then combines the motifs of the battle and pilgrimage of the nations into a pilgrimage of the survivors of the nations to the mount of God.

During the postexilic period, elements of Zion theology and themes associated with pentateuchal "salvation history" are integrated especially in late Deutero-Isaianic and Dtr passages (Ex. 15:13,17-18; Ps. 68:17-18,25b,30[16-17,24b,29]; 74:2-8; 78:68; 99:2,9; 132:3,6-8,13-15; 135:2,21).[177] Ex. 15:1b-18 (postexilic final version[178]) introduces into the pentateuchal story of Israel's beginnings the theologoumenon associating the demonstration of divine kingship that took place in the historical claiming of *ṣîyôn* as the mount of God (Ps. 47); it also expands this motif by asserting that Yahweh will protect *ṣîyôn* from both present and future enemies as the site where his own people assemble.[179]

Postexilic Zion theology combines priestly and prophetic traditions that were actually separate during the preexilic period. Parallel to the royal hymns to Yahweh,[180] the "songs of Zion" (Ps. 137:3) now acquire eschatological features (cf. also the eschatological revelation of royal dominion on *ṣîyôn* in Ps. 146:10; 149:2; Isa. 24:23; 52:7; Ob. 21; Mic. 4:7; Zeph. 3:15; Zech. 14:9);[181] similarly, motifs from the Psalms now also permeate postexilic prophetic traditions.[182]

The redaction of the pilgrimage psalms focuses on *ṣîyôn* as the point from which Yahweh's blessing emanates (Ps. 128:5; 129:8; 132:13ff.; 133:3; 134:3; cf. 125:1[183]) for

---

175. Loretz, *Prolog*, 63-81.

176. H. W. Wolff, *Micah* (Eng. trans. 1990), 117-18.

177. See Haglund, 109-111.

178. Concerning textual layering, see Zenger, "Tradition"; concerning questions of dating, see Jörg Jeremias, *Königtum Gottes*, 93 n. 2.

179. Strauss, *ZAW* 97 (1985) 103-9. Concerning the identification of *ṣîyôn* with the *har hammôrîyâ* (2 Ch. 3:1), see Gen. 22:2,14 (R. W. L. Moberly, "The Earliest Commentary on the Akedah," *VT* 38 [1988] 306-7) and the Khirbet Beit Ley Inscription A (J. Naveh, "Old Hebrew Inscriptions in a Burial Cave," *IEJ* 13 [1963] 74-92; on dating see J. Tigay, *You Shall Have No Other Gods: Israelite Religion in the Light of Hebrew Inscriptions. HSS* 31 [1986], 25-26); concerning parallels with the Psalms, see Seybold, *Wallfahrtspsalmen*, 79-80; P. D. Miller, "Psalms and Inscriptions," *Congress Volume, Vienna 1980. SVT* 32 (1981), 320-28.

180. Loretz, *Psalmen*, 491-92; Jörg Jeremias, *Königtum Gottes*, 121-47.

181. V. Maag, "Malkût JHWH," *Congress Volume, Oxford 1959. SVT* 7 (1960), 151 (= *Kultur, Kulturkontakt und Religion* [Göttingen, 1980], 145-69); O. Camponovo, *Königtum, Königsherrschaft und Reich Gottes in den frühjüdischen Schriften. OBO* 58 (1984), 74-116.

182. Wanke, 113-18.

183. Loretz, review of Beyerlin, *Weisheitliche Vergewisserung*, in *UF* 19 (1987) 422-23.

Israel as the community of *ṣîyôn*.[184] It now also links the notion of popular piety with *ṣîyôn* theology[185] and thereby individualizes the *ṣîyôn* motif of official religion into metaphors applicable to the life of the individual. The primeval establishment of *ṣîyôn* becomes a symbol of protection for the individual who trusts in Yahweh (125:1).[186] In a reverse fashion, personal distress becomes a metaphor for the fate of *ṣîyôn* itself (129:1,[2]). This exchange also shapes the redaction of the Korahite psalms.

3. *ṣîyôn Theology in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha.* In contrast to the Dtr History, later historical works use the term Σιών more frequently again (1 Mc. 4:37,60; 5:54; 6:48,62; 7:33; 10:11; 14:26; 3 Ezr. 8:78,[82]).[187] The wisdom tradition personifies *Siṓn* as a widow lamenting the abduction of her children (Bar. 4:9,14,24; cf. 4 Ezr. 9:38–10:24; Jth. 16:4[5]).[188] Jth. 9:13-14 picks up the motif of God's protection of *Siṓn* (cf. 13:11[189]). Jth. 9 and Sir. 36:16b-22[190] understand *Siṓn,* the temple, and Israel as the heirs to whom in the past Yahweh's deeds and promises were directed, and now associates them with the entreaty for judgment on their enemies. The wisdom context in Tob. 13:17 (cf. Rev. 21:10-21) enhances the eschatological expectations in Sir. 36:18-19(13-14) with elements of the miraculous and transforms them into the anticipation of the new Jerusalem as a city of gold and precious stones.

The exilic distancing from the name *ṣîyôn* already encountered in the Dtr History and in Ezekiel recurs in parts of apocalyptic literature. The geographical features of the southeast hill (e.g., 1 En. 36:2)[191] and of the Hinnom Valley (1 En. 37:1-5; 90:28)[192] are mythologically enhanced and now become the eschatological mount of God (1 En. 14:19; 18:8; 24:3; 25:3; 71:6; 4 Ezr. 8:52; 13:35-36)[193] and are combined with the motifs of paradise (1 En. 24:1–36:6; 2 Bar. 4; 4 Ezr. 7:36; Rev. 22:1-2, etc.), messianic deliverance from the onslaught of the nations (4 Ezr. 13:35; 2 Bar. 40:1-2; cf. 1 En. 56; Sib. Or. 3:663-97; 1QM 12:13,17; 19:5),[194] and judgment (1 En. 18:11a; 27:2-3; 90:26-27, etc.; cf. 2 K. 16:3; 2 Ch. 28:3; Isa. 66:24; Jer. 7:31ff.; 19:5ff.). Postexilic visions of a new Jerusalem (Isa. 62; 65:17-25)[195] come to focus on the discontinuity between the present and eschatological Jerusalem[196] and temple[197] (1 En. 14:18ff.; 24:1–25:4;

184. K. Seybold, "Die Redaktion der Wallfahrtspsalmen," *ZAW* 91 (1979) 247-68.
185. Seybold, *Wallfahrtspsalmen,* 77-85.
186. Beyerlin, *Weisheitliche Vergewisserung,* 61-62.
187. See III above. Concerning the contrast between ἄκρα and Σιών, see M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism* (Eng. trans. 1974), 277-92.
188. E. Zenger, *Das Buch Judit. JSHRZ* I/6 (1981), 445.
189. Ibid., 442.
190. See Marböck.
191. P. Grélot, "La géographie mythique d'Henoch et ses sources orientales," *RB* 65 (1958) 33-69.
192. S. Uhlig, *Das äthiopische Henochbuch. JSHRZ* V/6 (1984), 563-64, 702.
193. Terrien, 315-38.
194. See E. Lohse, *TDNT,* VII, 326.
195. Porteous, *FS W. Rudolph,* 248-49.
196. K.-L. Schmidt, 207-48.
197. Hamerton-Kelly.

71:5ff.; 89:72ff.; 90:28-29; 2 Bar. 4:3; 32:3-4; Sib. Or. 5:420ff.; *T. Levi* 3:4-5; T. Dan 5:12-13; T. Mos. 4:1ff.; 4 Ezr. 7:26; 10:27,40-57; 13:35-37a). Apart from the literary addendum 4 Ezr. 13:35-37a, none of these traditions associates the motif of the new Jerusalem with Zion. Indeed, 4 Ezr. 10:27 and 54 dissociate the new Jerusalem entirely from the site of the present Jerusalem. 1 Enoch, the Testament of Dan, the Sibylline Oracles, and the Testament ("Assumption") of Moses do not mention the proper name Zion; and as already seen, Josephus also consistently avoids mentioning Zion. Zion then also recedes noticeably in the NT, where 5 of the 7 occurrences are in connection with OT citations, including Mt. 21:5 (Isa. 62:11; Zech. 9:9); Jn. 12:15 (Isa. 40:9; Zech. 9:9-10); Rom. 9:33 (Isa. 8:14; 28:16); 11:26 (Isa. 59:20-21; Ps. 14:7); 1 Pet. 2:6 (Isa. 28:16). Only Heb. 12:22 and Rev. 14:1 do not refer to citations. 2 Bar. 5:1 and 32:2 juxtapose the new Jerusalem with Zion as the designation for the historical Jerusalem. By contrast, Jubilees identifies Zion, after the defilement of the present temple (Jub. 23:21), as the site of the eschatological temple and divine presence (1:17); Zion now surpasses Sinai, the garden of Eden, and the "Mount of Morning" as the mountain that as the navel of the world (8:19)[198] will be sacred in the new world and will free that world from sin (4:26).

VI. Translations.

1. *LXX.* LXX^{A} counts 13 (without the Apocrypha), LXX^{B} 15, occurrences of *Siṓn/Seiṓn* beyond what is already found in the MT[199] and that do exhibit certain overriding tendencies. LXX 1 K. 3:15; 8:1; Isa. 1:21; 52:1; Dnl. 9:19,24 identify *Siṓn* with *(pólis) Ierousalḗm,* while LXX Isa. 1:26 identifies it with the *mētrópolis.*[200] When the religious significance of Jerusalem is stressed, reference is made to the proclamation of judgment for *Siṓn* (LXX Isa. 1:21-26; Dnl. 9:24). Following this tendency, LXX Isa. 9:10(11) refers to *Siṓn* an oracle of doom originally directed against the northern kingdom. In LXX Isa. 22:1,5 the Hinnom Valley *(gê' ḥizzāyôn)*[201] becomes the *pháranx Siṓn.* Finally, in LXX Isa. 23:12 an oracle against Sidon becomes a warning of *Siṓn* against the Kittim (cf. 1QpHab 2:12).[202] In LXX Isa. 31:9 the oracle concerning Yahweh's fire on *ṣîyôn* and furnace in Jerusalem is recast into a beatitude concerning participation in the seed on *Siṓn* and fellowship in Jerusalem in reference to the announcement of the eschatological royal dominion (LXX Isa. 32:1-5). The understanding of royal dominion and *Siṓn* as the royal city also shaped the reinterpretation of LXX Ps. 2:6, *ṣîyôn har qoḏšî* into *Siṓn óros tó hágion autoú.* LXX Isa. 25:5[203] and 32:2 change *ṣāyôn* into *Siṓn.* One inter-

198. See Josephus *B.J.* 3.3.5 §52.

199. On the orthography see F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the NT and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago, 1961), §§38, 56.3.

200. See Philo *Flacc.* 46; *Leg. Gai.* 203, 281, 294, 305, 334; A. Kasher, *Cathedra* 11 (1983) 45-56; cf. J. Graham, *Colony and Mother City in Ancient Greece* (Manchester, 1964).

201. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27* (Eng. trans. 1997), 349, 358-59.

202. E. Otto, "Habakuk/Habakukbuch: Wirkungsgeschichte," *TRE,* XIV, 304-6 (with bibliog.).

203. See J. Coste, "Texte grec d'Isaie 25:1-5," *RB* 61 (1954) 36-66.

esting question is whether the translation of *gê' ḥizzāyôn* as *pháranx Siṓn* (LXX Isa. 22:1,5) announces a shift of the alleged site of *ṣîyôn* over to the southwest hill.

2. *Targumim.* Tg. 2 S. 5:7 renders *m^{e}ṣuḏaṯ ṣîyôn* as *hqr'*, orienting itself as does *ákra Dauid* (LXX Isa. 22:9; cf. LXX 2 S. 5:9; 1 K. 3:1; 10:22; 11:27; 12:24) toward the tradition of the history of construction in Jerusalem during the Hellenistic period.[204] Yahweh's presence on *ṣîyôn* is differentiated through reference to the *š^{e}ḵînâ* motif[205] and transcended through the notion of immediate divine presence (MT Isa. 18:7, *m^{e}qôm šēm yhwh ṣ^{e}ḇā'ôṯ har ṣîyôn* > Tg. Isa. 18:7: *'rṣ' d'tqry šm' yhwh ṣb'wt dy škyntyh bṭwr' dṣywn;* cf. Tg. Ps. 65:2[1]; 76:3[2]; Isa. 4:5; Ezk. 48:35; Joel 4:17,21[3:17,21]; Zech. 2:14-15[10-11]). The notion of the presence of the *š^{e}ḵînâ* on *ṣywn* stands alongside the presence in heaven (Tg. Isa. 3:5; Hab. 3:4).[206] The *mlkwt' dyhwh* (Tg. Isa. 1:4; 24:23) can also take over the immanent representation of Yahweh on *ṣywn*.

Like the LXX, the Targumim also emphasize the relationship between royal dominion and *ṣywn*. Tg. Ps. 87:5 associates *ṣywn* with the Davidic line, while Tg. Isa. 28:16; 46:13 associate it with a messianic figure. Tg. Ps. 84:8[7]; 87:2 update Zion theology with reference to the synagogue by associating *ṣywn* with the "house of instruction" as the center of the *knyšt'* (Tg. Ps. 97:8; Isa. 52:7; cf. also MT Isa. 31:9, *baṯ ṣîyôn* > *knyšt' dṣywn* in Tg. Isa. 1:9[8]; 12:6; 16:1; 37:22; 52:2; 62:11, etc.). Accordingly, *ṣywn* is emphasized in its significance for *mdrš'* and *'wryt'* in connection with the motif of judgment[207] (Tg. Isa. 1:9; 31:9). The oracle about the fire in Zion and the furnace in Jerusalem in the MT becomes in the Targumim a promise of the *zyhwr'* for those who follow instruction and a prediction of judgment by fire for those who transgress the *mymryh* (cf. in Tg. Isa. 33:14 the association with *gyhnm*). The wicked among Israel's own people allow *ṣywn* to fall into foreign hands (Tg. Mic. 4:11; cf. Tg. Jer. 4:18) and to be given over to the flames (Tg. Ezk. 24:12). The temple is destroyed (Tg. Isa. 53:5), and only a few dispersed Israelites will manage to survive among the foreign nations (Tg. Isa. 28:13). The Targumim also associate *ṣywn* with the idea of the remnant (Tg. Isa. 37:32); indeed, the promises of *ṣywn* apply to the surviving righteous ones (Tg. Isa. 28:16; 33:20; 60:14; 61:1, etc.).

Tg. Neof. Gen. 22:14; Ex. 4:27; Nu. 10:33 (cf. Tg. Neof. Ex. 18:5) identify Zion/Moriah with Sinai[208] as the locus of Yahweh's self-revelation.[209]

VII. Qumran. In addition to the passages cited by Kuhn,[210] *ṣywn* occurs in the Qumran writings largely in OT citations (4Q174 1-2, I, 12; 175, 29; 176, 24, 3; 177, 12-

---

204. Otto, *Jerusalem*, 115-16; → עיר *'îr*, XI, 67 (IV.3).

205. A. Chester, *Divine Revelation and Divine Titles in the Pentateuchal Targumim* (Tübingen, 1986), 313-24 (with bibliog.).

206. Smolar, et al., 221-22.

207. Smolar, et al., 173ff.; Uhlig, *JNES* 48 (1989).

208. Chester, *Divine Revelation*, 67-70, 159-68.

209. See Levenson, *Sinai and Zion*, 94-95; C. T. R. Hayward, "The Present State of Research in the Targumic Account of the Sacrifice of Isaac," *JSS* 32 (1981) 132-34.

210. Kuhn, 187; supplemented in idem, "Nachträge zur *Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten*," *RevQ* 4 (1963) 221.

13, I, 10; 179, II, 13; 180, 5-6, 4; 380, 1, I, 7; 504, 1-2, IV, 12; 11QMelch II, 16, 17 (rec.), 26; 11QPs[a] 22, II, 1-15; Lament 1, II, 13; Sl 10, 1, 13; Bt 3, 2, IV, 12). Here *ṣywn* occupies a central role in the description of the new Jerusalem (1QM 12:12-15; 4QPs[a] 12:1-15; 1QNJ ar [32]; 2QNJ ar [24]; 11QPs[a] 22, II, 1-15). Even though these texts envision a future Jerusalem, they reflect a community that does not question the centralization of the sacrificial cult at the Jerusalem temple.[211] The description of the "new Jerusalem" (1Q32; 5QNJ ar [15])[212] anticipates a great pilgrimage to the eschatological Jerusalem as well.[213] In a prayer addressing *ṣywn* itself, 11QPs[a] 22, II, 1-15 picks up on Isa. 54:1-8; 60:1-22; 62:1-8 and especially Isa. 66:10-11 in asserting that *ṣywn* is in the prayers of all who love her (11QPs[a] 22, II, 1, 15) and through whom God is reminded of his promises to the prophets (cf. QPs[a] 22, II, 6; cf. also the interpretation of Isa. 52:7 in 11QMelch II, 16, 17, which associates the mountains over which the *m^eḇaśśēr* traverses with the prophets' words to those of Zion who grieve, *'byly ṣywn*).[214] As is the case across a broad spectrum of late Israelite and early Jewish Zion theology, messianic expectations were also tied to *ṣywn* (4QFlor 1:12; 11QMelch II, 16, etc.).[215]

Otto

---

211. J. M. Baumgarten, *Studies in Qumran Law. SJLA* 24 (1977), 61.

212. D. Barthélemy and J. T. Milik, *DJD*, I, 134-35; J. T. Milik, *DJD*, III, 184-93.

213. See J. Licht, "An Ideal Town Plan from Qumran: The Description of the New Jerusalem," *IEJ* 29 (1979) 45-59.

214. See P. J. Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchireša'. CBQMS* 10 (1981), 20-21.

215. In this regard see P. Sacchi, "Esquisse du développement du messianisme juif à la lumière du text qumranien 11QMelch," *ZAW* 100 (1988) 202-14.

צִיץ *ṣîṣ;* צוץ *ṣwṣ;* צִיצָה *ṣîṣâ;* צִיצִית *ṣîṣiṯ;* נצץ *nṣṣ;* נֵץ *nēṣ*

Contents: I. Etymology. II. Synonyms, Antonyms. III. OT Occurrences. IV. Meaning: 1. Verb; 2. *ṣîṣ* I; 3. *ṣîṣiṯ;* 4. *ṣîṣ* II; 5. The Verb *nṣṣ;* 6. *nēṣ, niṣṣâ;* 7. *nîṣôṣ*. V. 1. LXX; 2. Qumran.

ṣîṣ. S. Bertman, "Tasseled Garments in the Ancient East Mediterranean," *BA* 24 (1961) 119-28; A. De Buck, "La Fleur au Front du Grand-Prêtre," *OTS* 9 (1951) 18-29; H. Donner, *Israel unter den Völkern. SVT* 11 (1964); S. Gevirtz, "Jericho and Shechem: A Religio-Literary Aspect of City Destruction," *VT* 13 (1963) 52-62; M. Görg, "Die Kopfbedeckung des Hohenpriesters," *BN* 3 (1977) 24-26; idem, "Keruben in Jerusalem," *BN* 4 (1977) 13-24; Z. Goldmann, "Das Symbol der Lilie: Ursprung und Bedeutung," *AKG* 57 (1975) 247-99; J. E. Hogg, "A Note on Two Points in Aaron's Headdress," *JTS* 26 (1925) 72-75; W. H. Irwin, *Isaiah 28–33: Translation with Philological Notes. BietOr* 30 (1977); O. Keel, *Jahwe-Visionen und Siegelkunst. SBS* 84/85

I. Etymology. The etymology of *ṣw/yṣ* is uncertain, though scholars generally distinguish the roots *ṣwṣ* I ("shine, blossom") and *ṣwṣ* II ("look").[1] Both roots (I and II) might derive from the same root with the basic meaning "shine, gleam,"[2] which might then easily acquire the specialized meanings "blossom" and "glance, look (with radiant eyes)." The noun deriving from *ṣwṣ* is *ṣîṣ* I (masc.; fem. *ṣîṣâ*), "flower, blossom, diadem." The term *ṣîṣ* occurs as a Canaanite loanword in Egyptian as *ḏîḏî*[3] and in Akkadian as the West Semitic loanword *ṣiṣṣatu* ("an ornamental blossom").[4] Concerning the derivative *ṣîṣiṯ* ("tassel"), cf. Akk. *ṣīṣītu,* which refers to a movable part of a loom.[5]

The verb *nṣṣ,* a parallel construction to *ṣwṣ* (I), occurs especially in later OT writings with the same meaning[6] and with its nominal derivatives *nēṣ* I (fem. *niṣṣâ*) and *nîṣôṣ.*[7]

II. Synonyms, Antonyms. Synonymous verbs to *ṣwṣ* I and *nṣṣ* include → פרח *prḥ* I and *yṣ'* hiphil (+ *peraḥ*), and antonyms include *'ml* pual, → יבש *ybš, mll* polel, and → נבל *nbl* I.

III. OT Occurrences. The verb *ṣwṣ* I occurs 8 times in the OT (Nu. 17:23[Eng. 8]; Ps. 72:16; 90:6; 92:8[7]; 103:15; 132:18; Isa. 27:6; Ezk. 7:10), and once in Sirach (43:19). The earliest occurrence is Ezk. 7:10, which belongs to the basic stratum of Ezekiel. One additional occurrence would be Zech. 9:16 if with Bewer one reads *yāṣîṣ* for *kṣ'n,* "[his people] will shine."[8] Finally, *ṣwṣ* II is a hapax legomenon (Cant. 2:9).

(1977); K. Kiesow, *Exodustexte im Jesajabuch. OBO* 24 (1979); H.-J. Krause, "*hôj* als profetische Leichenklage über das eigene Volk im 8. Jahrhundert," *ZAW* 85 (1973) 15-46; A. Kuschke, "Jeremia 48,1-8: Zugleich ein Beitrag zur historischen Topographie Moabs," *Verbannung und Heimkehr. FS W. Rudolph* (Tübingen, 1961), 181-96; C. Levin, *Der Sturz der Königin Atalja. SBS* 105 (1982); W. L. Moran, "Ugaritic *ṣîṣûma* and Hebrew *ṣîṣ,*" *Bibl* 39 (1958) 69-71; M. Noth, "Office and Vocation in the OT," *Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Studies* (Eng. trans. 1966), 229-50; A. E. Rüthy, *Die Pflanzen und ihre Teile im biblisch-hebräischen Sprachgebrauch* (Bern, 1942); S. Schroer, *In Israel gab es Bilder. OBO* 74 (1987); H. Utzschneider, *Das Heiligtum und das Gesetz. OBO* 77 (1988); T. Veijola, *Verheissung in der Krise: Studien zur Literatur und Theologie der Exilszeit anhand des 89. Psalms. AnAcScFen* B 220 (1982); M. Weippert, "Edom" (diss., Tübingen, 1971); G. J. Wenham, "Aaron's Rod (Numbers 17,16-28)," *ZAW* 93 (1981) 280-81; M. Zohary, *Plants of the Bible* (Cambridge, [2]1986).

1. Concerning related expression in Middle Hebrew, Jewish Aramaic, and Arabic, see *HAL,* III, 1013-14.

2. See J. Blau, "Über homonyme und angeblich homonyme Wurzeln," *VT* 6 (1956) 247-48; A. E. Rüthy, "'Sieben Augen auf einem Stein': Sach 3:9," *TZ* 13 (1957) 527 n. 10.

3. See Görg, *BN* 3 (1977) 25.

4. *AHw,* III, 1106.

5. *AHw,* III, 1105; additional documentation in *HAL,* III, 1024a. Concerning the noun *ṣîṣ* II ("saltworks"), see IV.2, 4 below.

6. Concerning the simultaneity of semantically equivalent verbs with medial *w/y* and medial geminates, see G. J. Botterweck, *Der Triliterismus im Semitischen. BBB* 3 (1952), 48.

7. For Middle Hebrew, Aramaic, and Arabic parallels, see *HAL,* II, 714b, 717-18.

8. J. A. Bewer, "Two Suggestions on Prov. 30:31 and Zech. 9:16," *JBL* 67 (1948) 62.

The nominal derivatives are more widely distributed. The term *ṣîṣ* I occurs 15 times, then also 3 times in Sirach (40:4; 43:19; 45:12). It occurs in a particular concentration in three different contexts: in an addendum to the prologue of Deutero-Isaiah (Isa. 40:6-8),[9] in P^S texts regarding the adornment of the high priest (Ex. 28:36; 39:30; Lev. 8:9; cf. also Nu. 17:23[8] P^S), and in the account of the temple construction (1 K. 6:18,29,32,35).[10] The word also occurs in Job 14:2; Ps. 103:15; and Isa. 28:1; Jer. 48:9 is uncertain.[11] The term *ṣîṣâ* occurs but once (Isa. 28:4), while *ṣîṣiṯ* in Nu. 15:38-39 is part of an addendum, and in Ezk. 8:3 part of the basic stratum. The term *ṣîṣ* II occurs only in material specific to the Chronicler (2 Ch. 20:16).

The verb *nṣṣ* with its nominal derivatives occurs especially in late poetic-wisdom texts (*nṣṣ:* Eccl. 12:5; Cant. 6:11; 7:13[12]; Ezk. 1:7 [an addendum from the Ezekiel school]; *nēṣ:* Gen. 40:10; Cant. 2:12; Sir. 50:8; *niṣṣâ:* Job 15:33; Isa. 18:5). The term *nîṣôṣ* occurs in Isa. 1:31 and Sir. 11:32 (also $Sir.^M$ 42:22).

IV. Meaning.

1. *Verb.* The verb *ṣwṣ* I, "blossom," occurs only once in the qal (Ezk. 7:10), otherwise in the hiphil (inner-transitive hiphil with acc. internal obj.). Nu. 17:23(8); Ps. 90:6; and Sir. 43:19 use it in the literal sense, while Ps. 92:8(7) and 103:15 use it metaphorically in a wisdom context to describe human fate, welfare, or threatened existence; Ps. 72:16 and Isa. 27:6 use it in connection with the eschatological *šālôm* motif. Ezk. 7:10 also uses the verb metaphorically if following Ezk. 9:9 we read *hammuṭṭeh* ("bending of justice") instead of *hammaṭṭeh* ("rod"). Ps. 132:18 ("but on him, his crown [*nēzer*] will gleam [*yāṣîṣ*]") uses a wordplay to refer to the high priest's blossom-shaped crown *(ṣîṣ).* Cant. 2:9 uses the verb parallel with the semantically equivalent *šgḥ* hiphil, "look."

2. *ṣîṣ I.* The subst. *ṣîṣ* I refers to actual flowers (the entire blossoming plant), to the blossoms themselves, to a blossom-shaped diadem/crown, or to a crown with blossom-shaped ornamentation. The flower and blossom were popular (wisdom) metaphors for transitoriness. Isa. 40:6b-8 uses the metaphor of field flowers withering under the harsh summer wind *(ṣîṣ haśśāḏeh)*[12] to refer to the weakness of all "flesh," i.e., of all historical human power (cf. Isa. 47);[13] in countering doubts about the divine message of consolation, the passage contrasts that anemic power with the incontestable stability of God's word.[14] Ps. 103:15 picks up the metaphor from Isa. 40 but then accentuates it differently with a reference to the similarity between the brevity of human existence and that of the flowers of the field (so also Job 14:2; cf. Ps. 90:5-6).

---

9. See Kiesow, 42.

10. Pre-Dtr according to M. Noth, *Könige 1–16. BK* IX/1 (²1983), 106; post-Dtr according to E. Würthwein, *Das erste Buch der Könige 1–16. ATD* XI/1 (1976), 60-61, 69-70.

11. See IV.2 below.

12. See Zohary, 169-81.

13. Concerning *ḥeseḏ* as "power, strength," see L. J. Kuyper, "The Meaning of חסד Isa xl 6," *VT* 13 (1963) 489-92; K. Elliger, *Deuterojesaja (40,1–45,7). BK* XI/1 (1978), 3.

14. See Kiesow, 66.

1 K. 6:18,29,32,35 mention flower ornamentation on the walls and doors of the main temple room *(hêkāl)* and on the doors to the *dᵉḇîr.* These *pᵉṭûrê ṣîṣṣîm* probably refer to "opened flower forms"[15] (cf. LXX), i.e., to opened blossoms or rosettes[16] rather than to garlands or to reliefs depicting calyxes. Along with flowers, 6:18,29,32,35 also suggest that gourds,[17] cherubs, and palms were depicted. This ornamentation was to be implemented in low relief on cedar or olivewood (v. 18).[18] No additional information regarding the appearance and arrangement of this flower ornamentation is provided, and since no comparable wood panels have been preserved, the exact implementation of these directives cannot be reconstructed. In any event, strips adorned with floral motifs are a popular device in the OT for subdividing walls and for decorating the edges of pictures.[19]

In Isa. 28:1 *ṣîṣ* acquires the specialized meaning "flower garland"; although the par. *ʿᵃṭārâ* can also mean "crown, diadem," here it refers primarily to a crown of flowers (cf. Prov. 1:9; 4:9; 14:24)[20] of the sort worn by revelers at a banquet[21] (also Ezk. 23:42?). The fading garland symbolizes the arrogant but doomed inhabitants of Ephraim. Isa. 28:4 reinterprets the metaphor in an addendum; now the semantic ambiguity of *ʿᵃṭārâ* ("garland," "crown") is adduced in turning the crown of flowers into a symbol of the city, i.e., of Samaria, surrounded by a crownlike wall;[22] the addition of the awkward *gêʾ šᵉmānîm* ("fertile/fat valley") also introduces this meaning into v. 1b.[23] This metaphor quite possibly derives from a certain type of "(city) wall crown" topped with small parapets attested first in 7th-century Assyria.[24] The fem. subst. *ṣîṣâ* in Isa. 28:4 can be understood as a noun of unit *(nomen unitatis),* and the hapax legomenon *ṣîṣâ* either as the result of a simple desire for variation or as a scribal error.[25]

In Ex. 28:36; 39:30; Lev. 8:9; Sir. 45:12, *ṣîṣ* refers to the golden head adornment of the high priest. In Sir. 40:4 the substantive refers either to the high priest or to the king (cf. v. 3). One's understanding of the derivation and meaning of this detail on the high priest's official vestments depends on the literary classification of the passages in question. In the basic stratum of Ex. 28 (vv. 2a,6*,9a,11,12aα,15-16,30a,36,37aα), the high priest's adornment includes alongside the apronlike ephod and the *ḥōšen* ("breastpiece") also a "golden flower" (metonym: diadem). This piece was fastened to the high

15. Noth, *Könige 1–16,* 102.
16. See Schroer, 49.
17. Ibid., 47-48.
18. See Noth, *Könige 1–16,* 101-2.
19. Ibid., 124-26; Schroer, 49-50.
20. → עטר *ʿāṭar,* XI, 27.
21. See H. Wildberger, *Jesaja (28–39). BK* X/3 (1982), 1047; Irwin, 4; a different view is taken by Krause, 31-32; concerning the custom of wearing a garland at banquets, see *LexÄg,* VI, 46; *KTU* 1.6, IV, 42-43; *PW,* XI/2, 1602; *KlPauly,* III, 324-25; → עטר *ʿāṭar,* XI, 24.
22. O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 13–39. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1974), 238, suggests the reference is to Shechem.
23. See Wildberger, *Jesaja 28–39,* 1042.
24. See E. Unger, *RLA,* II, 207.
25. See Donner, 76 n. 1; Wildberger, *Isaiah 28–39,* 1043.

priest's turban with a violet lace (NRSV "blue cord") and engraved with the inscription *qōḏeš lᵉyhwh* ("holy to Yahweh"). The inscription itself, besides confirming the high priest's special status, possibly also functioned apotropaically and enhanced the efficacy of the "flower," which is, "of course, already in itself a prophylactic, as it is an element of life and life-giving power,"[26] as attested by Egyptian examples.[27]

After the insertion of the instructions regarding the headpiece (Ex. 28:39 is secondary[28]), instructions are given for attaching the diadem (v. 37b). The details of the bombastic formulation appended in v. 38 are not entirely comprehensible, though the passage does associate the "flower" with the Israelites' sacrifices. "Should the sacrifice for any reason at all not be 'well-pleasing,' perilous 'guilt' would result, which the High Priest would have to take upon himself; the flower is in this case to protect him from the consequences of this 'guilt.'"[29]

The remaining information concerning the high priestly diadem in Exodus and Leviticus derives from later redactional material in the Priestly (P) cultic regulations.[30] Ex. 39:30 closely follows 28:36-38 (with addenda) and qualifies the golden diadem appositionally as *nēzer haqqōḏeš* ("holy diadem"; similarly also Lev. 8:9 and, dependent on it, Ex. 29:6). Later texts use the expression *nēzer haqqōḏeš* for the *ṣîṣ* on the headpiece of the high priest, and this additional designation as "holy" was probably prompted by the inscription and by the ornament's cultic function.

Noth believes that the priestly diadem was so designated after the model of the *nēzer* of the king, since during the postexilic period the diadem itself together with other parts of the king's regalia allegedly passed to the high priest.[31] It is doubtful the passages Noth adduces genuinely support this thesis. The mention of the *nēzer* in 2 K. 11:12aα comes from the hand of a late Priestly redactor who accommodates the enthronement of the king to the consecration ceremony of the high priest.[32] Priestly features are similarly inserted into the Davidic motif in Ps. 132:18, which derives from circles related to the Chronicler's theology. 2 S. 1:10 is on the whole a late text and is presumably dealing not with royal insignia at all, but rather with the amulets or identifying insignia of the army commander. The remark "you have defiled his [the king's] *nēzer* in the dust" in Ps. 89:40(39) is unique. Comparable expressions consistently use the expression *ʿᵃṭārâ* for "crown/diadem" (Jer. 13:18; Lam. 5:16; Ezk. 21:31[26]).[33] The term *ʿᵃṭārâ* is apparently the technical term for the crown of the Davidic kings (cf. 2 S. 12:30 par. 1 Ch. 20:2 and Isa. 62:3; Ps. 21:4[3]), and it also appears in the earliest witness for the royal ideology of the high priest (Zech. 6:11,14). Sir. 45:12 mentions a

---

26. M. Noth, *Exodus. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1962), 225.
27. See De Buck.
28. See Noth, *Exodus,* 225.
29. Ibid.
30. See ibid., 274-75; M. Noth, *Leviticus. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1965), 68-69. Concerning the priority of Ex. 28, see also Utzschneider, 246.
31. "Office and Vocation," 236; idem, *Exodus,* 226.
32. See Levin, 18, 46-47, 52-53; E. Würthwein, *Die Bücher der Könige,* part II: *1. Kön. 17–2. Kön. 25. ATD* XI/2 (1984), 348.
33. See Veijola, 99-100.

"crown of fine gold" (*ʿᵃṭereṯ paz*) alongside the *ṣîṣ* of the high priest (or are the two being identified?).

A great many diadems have been found that imitate flower garlands or are decorated with several adjoining, embossed (open) blossoms, or that themselves are shaped like blossoms or rosettes.[34]

The account of Aaron's sprouting staff in Nu. 17:16-26(1-11) alludes to the *ṣîṣ* as the diadem of the high priest. The substantive appears in v. 23(8) with its basic meaning as the internal object alongside the verb *ṣwṣ*. In connection with the late postexilic dispute regarding the legitimacy and function of the various groups of cult functionaries at the Jerusalem temple, this particular passage defends the position of the Aaronide priesthood (cf. Nu. 16–17).[35]

The meaning of *ṣîṣ* in Jer. 48:9 and of *ṣîṣîm* in Sir. 43:19 is disputed. It is questionable whether the word is to be associated with *ṣē/īṣūma* (Moran), a Ugaritic gloss to Akk. *eqel/eqlēt ṭabti*, "salt steppe" (saltworks?[36]). The Ugaritic term *ṣṣ* means "salt pit, garden."[37] According to Moran,[38] Jer. 48:9 ("give salt for Moab") is to be understood as a symbolic act referring to total destruction commensurate with Jgs. 9:45.[39] The LXX uses *sēmeía*, suggesting the cj. *ṣîyûn* ("gravemarker").[40] In Sir. 43:19 *ṣîṣîm* cannot mean "salt crystals," since the parallel cola compare frost with salt and *ṣîṣîm* with sapphire; the context (vv. 17b-20) rather suggests the meaning "ice flowers."[41]

3. *ṣîṣiṯ*. The derivative *ṣîṣiṯ* (collective sg.) refers to the flower/blossom-shaped ornamentation on a garment hem, i.e., to tufts or tassels (Nu. 15:38-39) or on the head or hair (Ezk. 8:3). Nu. 15:37-41 draws from Dt. 22:12 and provides a religious interpretation for the regulation that is missing from the passage in Deuteronomy, namely, that the tassels are to recall the commandments. V. 39 (secondary) then provides an additional explanation. The language here represents the mixed Dtr-P style typical of the later period. The tassels were originally status symbols or functioned apotropaically.[42]

4. *ṣîṣ II*. 2 Ch. 20:16 refers to a *ṣîṣ* ascent (*maʿᵃlēh haṣṣîṣ*). "Given the context here, it can refer only to the ascent from En-gedi to the plateau . . . the pass is generally interpreted as the 'ascent of flowers' . . . though it is also possible that the element צִיץ actu-

---

34. See Weippert, *BRL²*, 287-88, with illustrations; Schroer, 49, 412; *LexÄg*, I, 833; VI, 46; Görg, *BN* 3 (1977) 25-26; *ANEP*, no. 614.

35. Wenham, 280-81.

36. *AHw*, III, 1095a, 1377; see *PRU*, VI, 146. See also *BRL²*, 264-65.

37. *KTU* 4.344, 22; *HAL*, III, 1023b.

38. Moran, 71.

39. See Gevirtz, 62 n. 2; Kuschke, 184 n. 13.

40. See W. Rudolph, *Jeremia. HAT* I/12 (³1968), 274-75.

41. See *HAL*, III, 1023b, "frost crystals."

42. See *AuS*, V, 68ff., 82-83; Weippert, *BRL²*, 186; Galling, *BRL²*, 257; for iconographic pars. see Bertman.

ally refers to 'saltery, salt pan'; cf. Ugar. *ṣṣ*."[43] Harel documents a route up from Engedi to Tekoa and on to Jerusalem that might be identified with the "ascent of flowers."[44]

5. *The Verb nṣṣ.* In the qal the verb *nṣṣ* occurs only as a participle in Ezk. 1:7[45] with the meaning "glitter, gleam." In the hiphil the verb occurs in Eccl. 12:5; Cant. 6:11; 7:13(12) with the meaning "blossom, bloom." The reading in Eccl. 12:5 may involve a scribal error with the word *yānēṣ.* Rudolph considers changing the pointing in Cant. 6:11 to *hanāṣû* (perf. + interrogative particle) and a derivation from Middle Heb./Aram. *nwṣ.*[46] Grapes and pomegranates were popular ancient Near Eastern metaphors for female breasts, and the blossoming of the vine and pomegranate tree could symbolize the awakening capacity for love.[47]

6. *nēṣ, niṣṣâ.* The substantival derivatives of *nṣṣ* I, namely, *nēṣ* I and *niṣṣâ,* refer not to the entire flower but only to the blossom, with *nēṣ* referring to the individual blossom and to the entire group of blossoms especially on grapevines (Gen. 40:10; Sir. 50:8 [read *knṣny 'npym,* "such as flowering twigs"[48]]). Cant. 2:12 refers not to the splendor of the field flowers, but to that of the grapevine.[49]

Job 15:33 suggests understanding *niṣṣâ* as a collective. In Isa. 18:5 it seems to be a noun of unit *(nomen unitatis).*[50]

7. *nîṣôṣ.* The subst. *nîṣôṣ* (Isa. 1:31; Sir. 11:32) means "spark" (see discussion of Ezk. 1:7 above).

V. 1. *LXX.* The LXX translates the verbs *ṣwṣ* I and *nṣṣ* with the meaning "bloom, blossom," as *anthéō,* more frequently with *exanthéō.* In Isa. 27:6 *ṣwṣ* is translated as *blastánō* alongside *exanthéō* for *prḥ.* Sir. 43:19b deviates from the Hebrew text. The LXX rendering *diékypsan* in Ps. 91:8 is incomprehensible ("they looked through"). In Cant. 2:9 the LXX translates *ṣwṣ* II as *ekkýptō.*[51]

The LXX generally translates the nouns *ṣîṣ, ṣîṣâ, nēṣ,* and *niṣṣâ* in the basic meaning "flower, blossom," as *ánthos* (also in Isa. 28:1,4). In Gen. 40:10 it translates *nēṣ* as

---

43. Weippert, 326-27; on Ugar. *ṣṣ* see preceding discussion.

44. "Israelite and Roman Roads in the Judean Desert," *IEJ* 17 (1967) 19, 22; cf. P. Welten, *Geschichte und Geschichtsdarstellung in den Chronikbüchern. WMANT* 42 (1973), 148-49, 152.

45. Zorell, *LexHebAram,* s.v., takes a different view in interpreting the form as the polel ptcp. of a root *nwṣ* II attested only here.

46. W. Rudolph, *Das Buch Ruth — Das Hohelied — Die Klagelieder. KAT* XVII/1-3 (1962), 166. But cf. F. Delitzsch, *Song of Songs and Ecclesiastes. KD* (Eng. trans. repr. 1951), 116.

47. See O. Keel, *Song of Songs* (Eng. trans. 1994), 223.

48. *HAL,* II, 858.

49. Keel, *Song,* 101.

50. On the background see Kaiser, *Isaiah 13–39,* 95-96.

51. Concerning the LXX's deviation from the MT in Ezk. 1:7, see W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), 83.

blastós ("shoot"). The LXX renders the specialized meaning "diadem" as *pétalon* ("leaf, plate") in Ex. 28:36; 36:37 (= MT 39:30); Lev. 8:9, or as *stéphanos* ("wreath") in Sir. 40:4; 45:12. It calls the blossom ornaments in the temple interior (1 K. 6:32,35; vv. 18,29 are not in LXX) *pétala diapepetasména* ("spread leaves"). In Nu. 15:38-39 *ṣîṣiṯ* ("tassel") is rendered as *kráspedon* (pl.); the expression is paraphrased in Ezk. 8:3 by *tḗs koryphḗs mou,* and *nîṣôṣ* ("spark") is translated as *spinthḗr.*

2. *Qumran.* The verbs *ṣwṣ* and *nṣṣ* and their substantival derivatives are attested in Qumran only in their basic meanings and are largely used metaphorically. The term *ṣîṣ* occurs in 1QH 6:15; 4Q185 1-2, I, 10-11 (bis) in a citation from Isa. 40:6-8. The verb *ṣwṣ* I hiphil occurs in 1QH 7:8 as a metaphor for the effects of faith (cf. 6:15 and 10:32).

In 11QPs^a 24:13 (Ps. 155:14), *nṣṣ* refers to the "proliferation" of sin (cf. also 4Q500 1:2). In 11QPs^a 21:12 (Sir. 51:13ff.) *nēṣ* symbolizes the maturing of a person. The text of 1QH 10:32 is corrupt.

Steins

צֵל *ṣēl;* צָלַל *ṣālal* III; טָלַל *ṭālal* I

Contents: I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences; 3. Word Field; 4. LXX. II. Significance of Shadows in Palestinian Life: 1. Seasons and Days; 2. Shady Locales: a. Inside the City; b. Outside the City; c. Human and Animal Shadows; 3. Time. III. Figurative Use in the Ancient Near East and in the OT: 1. Protection; 2. Transitoriness. IV. Qumran.

I. 1. *Etymology.* The Heb. *ṣēl,* "shadow" (including the denominated verb *ṣll* II [Biblical Aram. טלל *ṭll* II] qal "become shady," hiphil "to shade, cover, put on a roof"), is a primary noun[1] that in this basic meaning is attested in all the Semitic languages.[2] Phonetic considerations in the various languages suggest a Proto-Semitic **θll.*[3]

The Semitic languages attest the following: Arab. *ẓill* (verb *ẓalla*);[4] Ugar. *ẓl;*[5] OSA

ṣēl. P. Bordreuil, "A l'ombre d'Elohim," *RHPR* 46 (1966) 368-91; G. Dalman, *AuS,* I/2, passim, esp. 504-7, 609; B. George, *Zu den altägyptischen Vorstellungen vom Schatten als Seele. Habelts Dissertationsdrucke. Klassische Philologie* 7 (1970); B. Halper, "The Participial Formations of the Geminate Verbs. III," *ZAW* 30 (1910) 201-28, esp. 216; W. Schenkel, "Schatten," *LexÄg,* V, 535-36; S. Schulz, "σκιά κτλ.," *TDNT,* VII, 394-400; concerning the contrast light/darkness, → חָשַׁךְ *ḥāšaḵ,* V, 245-59.

1. *BLe,* §61b'.
2. G. Bergsträsser, *Intro. to the Semitic Languages* (Eng. trans. 1983), 214-15.
3. Ibid., 214 n. 10; see *HAL,* II, 375b.
4. Wehr, 581-82; Lane, I/5, 1914-15.
5. *WUS,* no. 2371.

ẓll, verb *ẓll;*[6] Bedouin *ḍill;*[7] Akk. *ṣillu* (verb *ṣullulu*);[8] Biblical Heb. and Middle Heb. *ṣēl* (verb *ṣll*);[9] Eth. *ṣĕlālōt* (verb *ṣalala* II);[10] Tigr. *ṣĕlāl* (verb *ṣalla*);[11] Old Aram. *ṣll*[12] as a place-name or personal name.[13] Uncertain witnesses include Pun. *ṣl* and OSA *ṣll.*[14] In most of the Aramaic dialects (Egyptian Aramaic, Samaritan, Syriac, Mandaic, Christian Palestinian, etc.), one finds *ṭll,*[15] e.g., Jewish Aram. (determined) *ṭûllā', ṭ*ᵉ*lālā* (verb *ṭll*),[16] including Biblical Aram. *ṭll* II in Dnl. 4:9 and aramaizing Biblical Heb. *ṭll* I in Neh. 3:15.[17]

The noun *ṣēl* derives from the basic form **ṣill.*[18] The Tg., Vulg., and other witnesses apparently read the secondary form *ṣel'*ᵉ*lîm* in Job 40:21-22, referring to jujube trees (Arab. *ḍa'l*).[19] Alongside the nouns adduced here with the meaning "shade" (figurative: "protection") and the denominated verbs, many languages attest further derivations, often with a *mem* prefix with the meaning "shield, roof, house" (e.g., Ugar. *mẓll*[20] par. *mṯb,* "house"). Aramaic also attests the construction *ṭillānî,* "ghost," a semantic departure from the other examples.[21] The Heb. noun *ṣēl* is masculine (in Isa. 38:8 par. 2 K. 20:11, read *'ᵃšer yār*ᵉ*ḏâ + haššemeš* with LXX).

The term *ṣll* III (cf. Arab. *ẓalla* D, "to throw shadows, to shade"; see above) is not etymologically related to the homonymous Heb. root *ṣll* I (Arab. *ṣalla*), "to sound, resonate" (1 S. 3:11; 2 K. 21:12; Jer. 19:2; Hab. 3:16), or *ṣll* II, "to sink down" (cf. Arab. *ḍalla,* "disappear," Akk. *ṣalālu,* "lie down," Middle Heb. *ṣll,* "sink, become clear") (Ex. 15:10; probably also Sir. 34[31]:20, *qrb ṣwll* [LXX *métrios*], "clear, sober stomach"), nor with *ṭll* II (Arab. *ṭalla*), "wound" (1QIsaᵃ 50:6).[22] Hence the meaning of *ṣēl,* "shade," did not really develop from the notion of "something that passes away" (cf. Arab. *ḍalla*).[23]

---

6. Beeston, 172.
7. *AuS,* I/2, 504; see Bergsträsser, *Intro.,* 186.
8. *AHw,* III, 1101-2, 1110-11; *CAD,* XVI, 189-94, 238-43.
9. *HAL,* III, 1024-25, 1027-28; 1QH 6:15, etc.; Jastrow, 1281, 1284.
10. *LexLingAeth,* 1256-57.
11. *WbTigre,* 631-32.
12. *KAI* 222B.3; 223B.10.
13. See R. Degen, *Altaramäische Grammatik der Inschriften des 10.-8. Jh.s v. Ch. AKM* 38/3 (1969; ²1978), 32ff.; S. Segert, *Altaramäische Grammatik* (Leipzig, 1975), 86, 93.
14. *DNSI,* II, 967; Beeston, 142.
15. Documentation in *DNSI,* I, 423; *HAL,* III, 1024b; Beyer, 590.
16. Jastrow, 523, 537.
17. Wagner, 60.
18. Concerning the forms *ṣil*ᵉ*/*ᵃ*lô* (Job 40:22) and *ṣil*ᵉ*lê* (Jer. 6:4), see *BLe,* §§71x, 72t; *GK,* §10g. Concerning the aramaizing form *ṣ*ᵉ*lālîm* (Cant. 2:17 par. 4:6), see *GK,* §93ww.
19. *HAL,* III, 992b.
20. *KTU* 1.3, V, 39ff., etc. (*ANET,* 134b, l. 39).
21. Beyer, 590; see Jastrow, 538; *DNSI,* I, 423-24; see III below.
22. → מְצוּלָה *m*ᵉ*ṣûlâ,* VII, 515-16.
23. Lane, I/5, 1796c; contra Halper, 216 (falsely as *ẓalla*). Concerning the relationship with additional, phonetically similar Hebrew roots, → טַל *tal,* V, 323-30; → צֶלֶם *ṣelem,* XII, 386-96; → צַלְמָוֶת *ṣalmāweṯ.*

2. *Occurrences.* The noun occurs 52 times in the OT. In Isa. 34:15 read *bēṣeyhā,* "her eggs."[24] By contrast, emendations to or from *ṣēl* are unnecessary in Neh. 13:19;[25] Ps. 121:5; Eccl. 7:12; Jer. 48:45.[26] Uncertain passages include 1 S. 10:2, cj. *ṣēl ṣaḥ,* "glowing shadow," or *ṣēl ṣᵉḥîaḥ,* "shadow of a rock," for the place-name *ṣelṣaḥ* (NRSV Zelzah).[27]

The occurrences are distributed as follows: 2 in the Pentateuch; 6 in the Dtr History; 1 in Chronicles; 5 in Job; 10 in Psalms; 4 in Ecclesiastes; 3 in Canticles (2:17 and 4:6 are pars.); 8 in Isaiah (6 in secondary passages [38:8 par. 2 K. 20:11]); 2 in Deutero-Isaiah; 2 in Jeremiah; 1 in Lamentations; 4 in Ezekiel; 2 in Hosea; 2 in Jonah. The term occurs once in Sirach (14:27). In the OT the word occurs 8 times as subject, 7 as accusative object, once as dative object. It is the predicative noun in 3 passages (once with *kᵉ*), and in 5 the predicate in a substantive clause (twice with *kᵉ;* once with *bᵉ*). It is used 34 times with a preposition (*bᵉ, kᵉ* [both in textually uncertain passages], *lᵉ, min*), generally as an adverbial qualifier.

The verb *ṣll* III appears twice in the OT, once in Nehemiah (qal) and once in Ezekiel (hiphil); *ṭll* also occurs twice, once in Nehemiah (piel) and once in Daniel (Aram. haphel).

Although many passages are difficult to date (the language of the Psalms), most seem to belong to the postexilic period. Clearly preexilic passages include Gen. 19:8 J; Jgs. 9:15;[28] Isa. 30:2-3; Jer. 6:4; Hos. 4:13. Lam. 4:20 was probably composed shortly after 587 and employs archaic (courtly) language.[29]

3. *Word Field.* The word field of *ṣēl* is delimited by parallelism and context, and encompasses two main spheres.

a. The connotation "protection" has attracted to *ṣēl* verbal or substantive forms of the roots *str,* "conceal," *skk,* "isolate, cover protectively," *ksh,* "cover," *ḥbʾ,* "conceal," *šmr,* "watch, guard," *ḥsh,* "seek refuge," *ʿûz,* "take refuge" or *ʿzz,* "prove oneself strong";[30] also *nṣl* hiphil, "rescue," *ḥyh,* "live," *yšb bᵉ/taḥaṯ,* "sit in/under," etc.

b. When the reference is to the "transitorinesss" of a shadow,[31] *ṣēl* can be used together with *nṭh,* "extend, stretch out," *ʿbr,* "pass by," *sûr,* "give way," *ʿśh yāmîm,* "waste days," *hlk,* "go (forward)" (in contrast to *šûḇ,* "go back"), *brḥ,* "disappear" (in contrast to *ʿmd,* "remain," *ʾrk,* "last a long time," *miqweh,* "lingering"). Parallels to *ṣēl* include *heḇel,* "breath," *ʾarbeh,* "locust," *ṣîṣ,* "flower," *ʿēśeḇ,* "weed," and especially the "days" *(yāmîm)* of human beings *(ʾāḏām).*[32]

---

24. See H. Wildberger, *Jesaja (28–39). BK* X/3 (1982), 1329.
25. See II.2.a.
26. See III.1.c.
27. See *HAL,* III, 1030-31, and the comms.
28. T. Veijola, *Das Königtum in der Beurteilung der deuteronomistischen Historiographie. Suomalaisen Tiedeakatemian Toimituksia* B 198 (Helsinki, 1977), 120.
29. See H. J. Boecker, *Klagelieder. ZBK* XXI (1985), 14, 84.
30. → מָעוֹז *māʿôz,* VII, 441-48.
31. See III.2.
32. Concerning the various imagery, also → חָצִיר *ḥāṣîr,* V, 127-30.

Concerning the broader word field, cf. → חשך *ḥāšak*,[33] "be dark," though *ṣēl* is not actually used with this root itself in the OT. The reason may be that *ḥōšek*, "darkness," refers more to the threatening side of darkness, while *ṣēl* refers more to its beneficent side.[34]

4. *LXX*. The LXX translates *ṣēl* 31 times (beyond the MT also in Job 15:29; Isa. 38:8[end]) with *skiá* (otherwise only *skiá thanátou* for *ṣalmāwet*) and once as *skiázein*, 14 times (and in important variants Jgs. 9:15; Isa. 25:5[end]; 51:16) as *sképē* (Gen. 19:8 variant *stégē*) and once as *skepázein*, once each as *aspháleia* (Isa. 34:15) and *kairós*. It remains untranslated 4 times. The LXX renders *ṣll (ṭll)* III once in the piel as *skepán* (variant *stégein*) and 4 times in the hiphil or haphel as *skiázein* (Dnl. 4:9[12] variant *kataskēnoún*; 2 S. 20:6; Jon. 4:6 [intentional wordplay!] misread from *nṣl* hiphil) and once (only in Ezk. 31:3 variant) as *sképē*; in Neh. 13:19 the LXX reads *ṣll* II (see below).

The LXX translation *katáskios* in Zech. 1:8 (MT *m^eṣūlâ*) presupposes a participial adjective from the root *ṣll* III. An easier conjecture than **m^eṣillâ*, "tent, hut, shady place" (Arab. *miẓallah*),[35] is to assume the defective spelling of → מצולה *m^eṣûlâ*, "depth." Similarly *sýskios* for *m^eṣillôt*, "ring, sound," in 14:20 variant incorrectly presupposes a form of *ṣll* III.[36]

The LXX translates *ṣll* I 3 times as *ēcheín (proseuchḗ* Hab. 3:16 after Aram. *ṣl'*, "pray"),[37] *ṣll* II once as *dýein* and once as *kathistánai* (MT probably reads *ṣll* III).

II. Significance of Shadows in Palestinian Life.

1. *Seasons and Days*. The OT originally reckoned only with the seasons of summer and winter (Gen. 8:22; Ps. 74:17, etc.). The searing east wind could appear as early as mid-April (Hos. 13:15; Jon. 4:8, etc.), making the weather unbearably warm.[38] At the beginning of April, the sun strikes Jerusalem at an angle of over 62°, eventually climbing to 81°.[39] Accordingly, shade is of enormous importance in the heat of the Palestinian summer. Temperatures quickly rise during midday (1 S. 11:9; Sir. 43:2ff.), sometimes becoming unbearable even in the shade of houses as early as 10 a.m.[40] At "midday" *(ṣoh^orayim)*, when during the hottest time of the day *(ḥōm hayyôm)* the light is the brightest and even the shadows disappear (cf., e.g., Isa. 58:10; 16:3),[41] people (Gen. 18:1ff.; Sir. 34:16, etc.) and animals (cf. Cant. 1:7; Isa. 49:10; while giving birth,

---

33. → V, 245-59.
34. See III.
35. Additional suggestions in K. Seybold, *Bilder zum Tempelbau. SBS* 70 (1974), 67ff.
36. See even W. Rudolph, *Haggai — Sacharja 1–8 — Sacharja 9–14 — Maleachi. KAT* XIII/4 (1976), 72, 233; Bab. *Pesaḥ*. 50a.
37. See *HAL*, III, 1027a.
38. O. Keel and M. Küchler, *Orte und Landschaften der Bibel*, I (Zurich/Cologne/Göttingen, 1982), 38ff.
39. Roughly comparable to Dallas, Texas, U.S.A.; by contrast, it strikes Edmonton, Alberta, Canada, and Berlin, Germany, at ca. 60°; see *AuS*, I/2, 281, 482.
40. See *AuS*, I/2, 473, 484, 615.
41. See II.3.

10:17, etc.). Nomads find respite in the shade of their tents (cf. Gen. 18:1; 4:20, etc.; Ugar. *ẓl ḫmt,* "shadow of the tent[?]"[63]).

c. *Human and Animal Shadows.* Only rarely does the OT refer to human shadows. The *šûlammîṯ* wishes to sit in the shadow of her beloved (Cant. 2:3), and the people in the shadow of their king (Lam. 4:20; Ezk. 31:2-3,6ff., etc.).[64] Even a hand can cast a shadow (Isa. 49:2; cf. 51:16), or, among animals, a bird's wings (*kᵉnāpayim;*[65] Ps. 17:8; 36:8[7]; 57:2[1]; 63:8[7]; cf. 91:1,4; also Isa. 8:8, etc.).[66] All these passages, however, metaphorically enhance the actual extension of both human and animal shadows.

3. *Time.* Time can be measured against the regular course of shadows. At midday during the summer, objects such as walls and a vertically held finger cast no shadow at all[67] (e.g., Isa. 16:3), while that of animals is directly below them (Bab. *Pes.* 50a). Another fixed time is when an object and its shadow are the same size.[68] The hour of wage payment may also have been determined by the lengthening of shadows (Jer. 6:4; Cant. 2:17; Job 7:2;[69] cf. Dt. 24:14-15; Neh. 13:19). More precise sundials (shadow tables, directional dials) were introduced beginning in the 2d millennium in Mesopotamia and Egypt, one from the Late Bronze Age having been discovered in Gezer.[70] Nonetheless, the "steps," *maʿᵃlôṯ,* in 2 K. 20:9-11 par. Isa. 38:8 (NRSV "intervals") probably refer to a staircase rather than to a sundial (so already Tg., Vulg.).[71] In any event, the point here is that Yahweh abrogates an apparently dependable natural law (cf. Josh. 10:12ff.).[72]

III. Figurative Use in the Ancient Near East and in the OT. The "shadow" has its own logogram or determinative in the Babylonian-Assyrian and Egyptian scripts.[73] Characteristic features of its figurative use in the ancient Near East include the four aspects of blackness, semblance, coolness/protection, and quick, silent movement.[74]

The aspect of "darkness" plays no role as a comparative element in the OT's figurative use of shadows, deferring rather to the deeper (Isa. 16:3) blackness of nocturnal darkness.[75] The OT similarly only rarely adduces the element of semblance (cf. Jgs.

---

63. *KTU* 1.14, II, 12; III, 55.
64. See III.1.a.
65. → כָּנָף *kānāp,* VII, 229-31.
66. See III.1.b.
67. *AuS,* I/2, 596, 610-11; see *ANET,* 445b, Prophecy of Neferti: "No one knows when midday falls, for his shadow cannot be distinguished."
68. *AuS,* I/2, 614.
69. *GesTh,* 1169.
70. E. Graefe, *LexÄg,* V, 1105-6; G. Fohrer, *BHHW,* III, 1822-23; M. Weippert, *BRL*², 166.
71. See the thorough discussion in Wildberger, *Jesaja 28–39,* 1453.
72. See III.2.
73. *MI* in PNs, otherwise *GIŠ.MI,* Sum. *gissu,* Akk. *ṣillu.* See R. Borger, *Akkadische Zeichenliste. AOAT Sonderreihe* 6 (1971), nos. 296, 427. Egyptian has the sunshade hieroglyph *šw[y].t;* see *WbÄS,* IV, 432-33; George, 6; New Egyp. *h3b.t* > *hyb.t;* see George, 9-10; also *WbÄS,* III, 225.
74. George, 4.
75. → חָשַׁךְ *ḥāšak,* V, 245-59; → צַלְמָוֶת *ṣalmāweṯ.*

9:36; Job 17:7). In particular, Biblical Hebrew does not attest the meaning of "ghost, shadowy figure" that developed from the notion of semblance in Egyptian, Aramaic, and Greek.[76] Ugaritic witnesses for *ẓl,* "spirit," might be present in *KTU* 1.161, 1 (pl.).[77]

1. *Protection.* a. *The King.* In both Mesopotamia and Egypt the king claimed to be the shadow protecting the country and the world.[78] The king's umbrella symbolizes this dominion.[79] In Mesopotamia stepping into his shadow bestows on a person a privileged and possibly well-compensated status,[80] and in Egypt the king's "frond bearer" *(ṯ3yḫw)* was the title of an official position.[81]

Lam. 4:20 presupposes the presence of this royal ideology during the preexilic period, although the older OT witnesses do contest this function of the shadow/protective power with regard to both their own and the Egyptian king (Jgs. 9:15; Isa. 30:2-3; Lam. 4:20), or predict the felling of the ruler viewed as the "tree" of the world (Ezk. 31*;[82] also Isa. 10:33; Ezk. 17:24; 19:10ff.; Dnl. 4). Later passages, however, anticipate that the messianic ruler will prove worthy of this claim (Isa. 32:2; Ezk. 17:23). Dnl. 4:7-8(10-11) recounts the rise and fall of Nabonidus.[83]

b. *God.* The notion of the "shadow" of a god is also a widespread motif in the ancient Near East.[84] Alongside the king (though only the king in Egypt[85]), other figures also invoked such divine protection in Mesopotamia.[86] According to one source, however, "a god's shadow is the human being, and a slave (?) is the shadow of a human being . . . but the king is the mirror (?) of the god"[87] (here *ṣillu* seems to mean "reflection, semblance").[88]

---

76. For Egyptian see *WbÄS,* IV, 433; *RÄR,* 675; George, passim; Schenkel, 535-36. For Aramaic see I.1; *AuS,* I/2, 639. For Greek see, e.g., Homer *Od.* 10.495; Schulz, 397. Also → רְפָאִים *r^epā'îm;* → אֱלֹהִים *'^elōhîm,* I, 267-84.

77. See M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, "Epigraphische und inhaltliche Probleme in *KTU* 1.161," *UF* 15 (1983) 17-24, esp. 18, who identify this word as a secondary form of *ṣlm,* "statue"; cf. J. de Rougé, *Inscriptions hiéroglyphiques copiées en Égypte. Études égyptologiques* IX (Paris, 1977), 78/20, 15; J. C. de Moor, "An Incantation against Evil Spirits," *UF* 12 (1980) 429-32, esp. 430, 432.

78. Mesopotamia: W. H. P. Römer, *Sumerische "Königshymnen" der Isin-Zeit* (Leiden, 1965), 21/23-24, 51-52; cf. 18-19, 62 n. 147, 210/212-13; *CAD,* XVI, 191-92, 243; e.g., CH II, 48; XXIV, 46 (*TUAT,* I, 41; 76; *ANET,* 163-80). Egypt: *WbÄS,* IV, 432; George, 5 n. 9, 128-29. See esp. Bordreuil, 373, 375ff.; F. Crüsemann, *Der Widerstand gegen das Königtum. WMANT* 49 (1978), 21-22; Wildberger, *Jesaja 28–39,* 1255-56.

79. See II.2.a.

80. A. L. Oppenheim, "Assyriological Gleanings IV," *BASOR* 107 (1947) 7-11, esp. 9-10.

81. B. Schmitz, *LexÄg,* VI, 1162; EA 106:38 (cf. II, 1171): *muṣalil (šarri);* cf. also the Journey of Wen-Amon to Phoenicia, II, 45-46, *TGI*², 46; *ANET,* 28, ll. 45-46.

82. See G. Widengren, *The King and the Tree of Life. UUÅ* (1951/4), 58; W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1983), 146-48.

83. See R. Meyer, *Das Gebet des Nabonid. SSAW* 107/3 (1962).

84. See A. Falkenstein, *Sumerische Götterlieder. AHAW* (1959/I), 15/22, 83/87; *CAD,* XVI, 190-91, 242 (esp. regarding PNs); *WbÄS,* IV, 432-33; George, 5 n. 8; 127-28.

85. *RÄR,* 675.

86. E.g., *ABL,* 451, 11-12; Oppenheim, *BASOR* 107 (1947) 9-10; also PNs.

87. See *BWL,* 282; Bordreuil, 376-77 (with bibliog.).

88. *ABL,* 652 r., 10-11.

Yahweh provides a shadow as comprehensive, vital[89] protection to those who "trust" in him (*bṭḥ,* Ps. 91:1-2), particularly to the "weak" *(dal)* and the "poor" *('eḇyôn,* Isa. 25:4), the "servant" (*'eḇeḏ,* Isa. 49:2-3),[90] indeed, to "people" in general (*bᵉnê 'āḏām,* Ps. 36:8[7]).

The OT also views Yahweh as a great bird (Ps. 17:8; 36:8[7]; 57:2[1]; 63:8[7]; cf. 91:[1],4; Ruth 2:12; Dt. 32:11, etc.)[91] with whom the small bird (the supplicant; cf. Ps. 74:19; 91:3-4, etc.) "seeks refuge" (*ḥsh bᵉ,* etc.). Such statements derive from expressions of trust.

Some scholars believe the *kᵉnāp̄ayim,* "wings," actually refer to the protected, asylum area surrounding the pair of cherubim in the "holy of holies" (*dᵉḇîr,* 1 K. 6:23ff.).[92] This notion was indeed widespread, and is noticeable especially in Egyptian portrayals of the gods.[93]

Yahweh is also portrayed as a shady tree (Hos. 14:8-9[7-8]), a house (Ps. 91:1?[94] cf. Isa. 25:4), and anthropomorphically (Isa. 49:2; 51:16; cf. Ps. 139:5); or he casts shadows by means of clouds, a canopy (Isa. 4:5; cf. 25:4-5), or a plant (Jon. 4:6).[95]

Yahweh is equated with *ṣēl* in Ps. 121:5; Isa. 25:4 (said of foreign gods in Nu. 14:9[E? P?]!); only subsequently is the image of Yahweh's shadow developed in Hos. 14:8(7) or of Shaddai in Ps. 91:1. None of these passages dates reliably to the preexilic period, though Isaiah does proleptically pick up and transform this psalm language (30:2).[96]

The personal names constructed with *ṣēl* are probably also quite old,[97] including *bᵉṣal'ēl* (abbreviated forms *bṣl,*[98] *bēṣay, ṣillᵉṯay;* cf. Akk. *ina-ṣilli*-GN), *haṣlelpônî, ṣᵉlop̄ḥāḏ* (LXX, **ṣēlpaḥaḏ,* a divine name[99]). Uncertain examples include *ṣillâ* (Gen. 4:19ff. suggest *ṣll* I, "sound, resonate"); cf. also *'ᵃḇîṭal, ḥᵃmûṭal,* Old Aram. *ṣll;*[100] Ugar. *ẓll.*[101] By contrast, *ṣalmunnā',* the place-name *ṣelṣaḥ,*[102] and *ṣᵉlāṣal* probably do not belong to *ṣēl* (cf. the lexicons).

c. *Other.* Protective shade can also be provided by a country or people (Isa. 30:2, Egypt; cf. Ps. 80:11[10], Israel), a city (Jer. 48:45, Heshbon [*BHS* cj. *'ēṣel,* "next to," is

89. See II above.

90. See II.1 above.

91. See II.2.c above.

92. W. Beyerlin, *Die Rettung der Bedrängten in den Feindpsalmen der Einzelnen. FRLANT* 81 [99] (1970), 108-9, 148, etc.

93. O. Keel, *The Symbolism of the Biblical World* (Eng. trans. 1978), 190-91, 173; *WbÄS,* IV, 432 (Isis).

94. H. Gunkel, *Die Psalmen. HKAT* II/2 (⁵1968), 403.

95. See II.2 above.

96. O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 13–39. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1974), 285-86.

97. See esp. *IPN;* Bordreuil, 380-81, 385-86.

98. Arad, 49:1.

99. H. P. Müller, "Gott und die Götter in den Anfängen der biblischen Religion," in O. Keel, ed., *Monotheismus im alten Israel und seiner Umwelt. BB* 14 (1980), 120.

100. See I.1. above.

101. *KTU* 4.610, I, 12.

102. See I.2.

"like shadows."[114] 11QPs[a] 19:12 picks up the motif of the refuge provided by God's shadow. The context in 4Q502 8:3 and 4Q504 27:2 is corrupt.

Schwab

---

114. See H. Lichtenberger, "Eine weisheitliche mahnrede in den Qumranfunden (4Q185)," in M. Delcor, et al., *Qumrân: Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu. BETL* 46 (1978), 154-55.

צָלַח *ṣālaḥ*

Contents: I. Etymology and Meaning. II. Occurrences. III. Use: 1. Qal; 2. Hiphil: a. With Human Subjects; b. With Yahweh/God as Subject. IV. Qumran and LXX.

I. Etymology and Meaning. The root *ṣlḥ* is fairly common not only in Hebrew but also in the South Semitic (Old South Arabic; Tigriña) and Northwest Semitic languages, namely, in Phoenician and Punic in personal names, then also in Aramaic,[1] in Biblical Aramaic,[2] Jewish Aramaic, on into Samaritan and Syriac.[3] The root does not appear in Ugaritic or in Aramaic inscriptions.

Evidence shows, however, that the root could exhibit an extremely broad semantic spectrum, including "to split, set on fire, be successful, intrude, succeed, advance," etc. The result was that early on, scholars assumed not only that a semantic development or fanning out had taken place (e.g., between the individual verbal "stems"; cf. the pael and [h]aphel in Aramaic or Syriac), but also that different roots were actually involved.[4] More recent dictionaries (also Puech and Sæbø), however, assume correctly that a single root underwent a semantic development in the sense of "force in, penetrate → split → permeate," "get beyond a person → succeed."[5] By contrast, Blau adduces

---

ṣālaḥ. J. Blau, "Über homonyme und angeblich homonyme Wurzeln II," *VT* 7 (1957) 98-102, esp. 100-101; E. Puech, "Sur la racine 'ṣlḥ' en hébreu et en araméen," *Sem* 21 (1971) 5-19; M. Sæbø, "צלח *ṣlḥ* to succeed," *TLOT*, III, 1077-80; H. Tawil, "Hebrew צלח/הצלח, Akkadian *ešēru/šūšuru:* A Lexicographical Note," *JBL* 95 (1976) 405-13.

1. Ahiqar 125; see *DNSI*, II, 967; Beyer, 676.
2. See II below.
3. See *HAL*, III, 1025-26; Sæbø, 1077; also Puech.
4. See the surveys in Blau and in Tawil, 405-6.
5. See Sæbø, 1077; Tawil, 407.

Am. 5:6 and Sir. 8:10 in postulating the presence of a root *ṣlḥ* II, "ignite, burn."[6] Although Tawil also adduces the Akk. root *ešēru/šūšuru* to illustrate and support the semantic breadth of Heb. *ṣlḥ,* this Akkadian root does not and cannot function as a related parallel to *ṣlḥ.*

II. Occurrences. The root *ṣlḥ* occurs only as a verb in the OT, with 25 occurrences of the qal and 40 of the hiphil, as well as 4 in the haphel in the Aramaic portions of the OT (Ezr. 5:8; 6:14; Dnl. 3:30; 6:29[Eng. 28]). The qal occurs in Nu. 14:41; Jgs. 14:6,19; 15:14; 1 S. 10:6,10; 11:6; 16:13; 18:10; 2 S. 19:18(17); Ps. 45:5(4); Isa. 53:10; 54:17; Jer. 12:1; 13:7,10; 22:30(bis); Ezk. 15:4; 16:13; 17:9,10,15; Dnl. 11:27; Am. 5:6. The hiphil occurs in Gen. 24:21,40,42,56; 39:2,3,23; Dt. 28:29; Josh. 1:8; Jgs. 18:5; 1 K. 22:12,15; 1 Ch. 22:11,13; 29:23; 2 Ch. 7:11; 13:12; 14:6(7); 18:11,14; 20:20; 24:20; 26:5; 31:21; 32:30; Neh. 1:11; 2:20; Ps. 1:3; 37:7; 118:25; Prov. 28:13; Isa. 48:15; 55:11; Jer. 2:37; 5:28; 32:5; Dnl. 8:12,24,25; 11:36.

To these passages one can also add Hebrew Sir. 8:10; 11:17; 38:14; 43:26 (qal); 9:12; 39:18; 41:1 (hiphil), and 4 occurrences in the Qumran texts, including CD 13:21 (hiphil); 1Q27 fr. 1, II:5 (qal?); 11QT 53:21 (hiphil); 4Q381 48:3 (hiphil).

The word field of *ṣlḥ* includes especially → כשר *kāšēr* (with derivatives) and → שׂכל *śkl.*[7] The more or less fixed expressions in which *ṣlḥ* is used are also of importance.[8]

Problematical translations or readings include Am. 5:6 (force an entry, penetrate — cf. Sir. 8:10? — as "ignite and then burn"? LXX *analámpein*) and 2 S. 19:18(17) ("they passed through the Jordan": is the underlying notion "cut through, penetrate" here as well?).[9]

III. Use.

1. *Qal.* Compared to the passages in the hiphil with their direct and indirect references to Yahweh or God,[10] those using the qal, while not necessarily more concrete, are perhaps semantically somewhat reduced and may even include those problem passages mentioned above (Am. 5:6; 2 S. 19:18[17]). One textual group includes the expression "the spirit of Yahweh 'attained' [= came upon] a person." The LXX generally uses *hállomai* or its derivatives in these passages, all of which include either an account or a promise ("will attain") in speaking about this particular gift (Jgs. 14:6,19; 15:14: Samson; 1 S. 10:6,10; 11:6; 16:13; in 1 S. 18:10, "an evil spirit from God" rushes upon Saul).

The most common notion is that someone "succeeds" at something, or is able to "complete" it. According to Ezk. 16:13, Jerusalem "attained" royal status (addendum?). Ps. 45:5(4) probably articulates a wish to the king.[11] According to Isa. 53:10,

---

6. See the critical responses of Sæbø, 1077; and Tawil, 411-13.
7. Sæbø, 1079, adduces more distantly related terms.
8. See III below.
9. On both passages and the suggested translations or emendations, see *HAL,* III, 1026-27.
10. See 2 below.
11. Concerning other interpretations, see *HAL,* III, 1026.

projects and military undertakings.[18] Here too it is ultimately Yahweh who is responsible for that success even though such is not explicitly stated. The same applies to Prov. 28:13, according to which "no one who conceals transgressions" will be successful.

Finally, the supplications and petitions in Ps. 118:25 and Neh. 1:11 make clear that earthly success is ultimately viewed as coming from Yahweh.

b. *With Yahweh/God as Subject.* In both straight narrative and promises, *ṣlḥ* with Yahweh as the explicit subject is used to interpret and understand certain events as the result or as part of divine guidance. Such is the case in Gen. 24, where *ṣlḥ* hiphil functions virtually as a leitmotif (vv. 21,40,42,56), and in Gen. 39:2,3,23, and Josh. 1:8, the last of which again links the notion with loyalty to the Torah (cf. Ps. 1:3).

The combination of *ṣlḥ* hiphil and the assertion that Yahweh was "with" someone[19] (Gen. 39:2,3,23) also occurs in 1 Ch. 22:11; 2 Ch. 13:12. The interpretive remark "Yahweh will give it into the hand" is used in 1 K. 22:12,15; cf. 2 Ch. 18:11,14 as parallels. It comes as no surprise that in this connection *ṣlḥ* is often associated with a person's "way"[20] (in the concrete sense as the path from A to B in Jgs. 18:5?; cf. the figurative use in Gen. 24:21,40,42,56; Josh. 1:8; Isa. 48:15 [Cyrus]; also Dt. 28:29; cf. also 11QT 58:21).

This particular understanding of divine guidance is also evident, in an even more figurative sense, in Isa. 55:11 (Yahweh's word "succeeds"); Neh. 2:20; and part of a war address in 2 Ch. 20:20 that can be compared to Isa. 7:9. Sir. 39:18 probably also belongs in this context.

Of course, Yahweh can also choose not to allow something to succeed. In this capacity, he may be mentioned directly or indirectly as the subject, as in the curse in Dt. 28:29, or in the oracles of judgment in Jer. 2:37; 32:5. 2 Ch. 13:12 speaks in this way about Israel's war against Judah, which Yahweh (v. 10) will not allow to succeed.

IV. Qumran and LXX. The 4 occurrences of this root in the Qumran writings follow OT usage. CD 13:21 (and probably also the fragment 1Q27 fr. 1, II:5) speaks about how someone will "not succeed," the reference being to an opponent of the Qumran community or to someone similarly negatively qualified. 11QT 58:21 associates the verb in the hiphil[21] with success "in all his ways on which he has set out." 4Q381 48:3 uses the verb in connection with the (new) creation when the petitioner pleads for success "through the breath of your mouth."

The LXX translates *ṣlḥ* largely with *euodoún* (and its derivatives)[22] and with *hállesthai* (and its derivatives; esp. in connection with the expression "Yahweh's/God's spirit comes upon someone"). More than ten additional lexemes are used for rendering more precise semantic nuances in individual passages.

Hausmann

---

18. In this regard see P. Welten, *Geschichte und Geschichtsdarstellung in den Chronikbüchern. WMANT* 42 (1973), 18, 50; T. Willi, *Die Chronik als Auslegung. FRLANT* 106 (1972), 171, 177, 227-28.

19. → את *'ēṯ ('ēth),* I, 449-63.

20. → דרך *dereḵ (derekh),* III, 270-93.

21. See III.2.b.

22. In this regard see W. Michaelis, "εὐοδόω," *TDNT,* V, 109-14.

צֶלֶם *ṣelem*

Contents: I. Word: 1. Etymology; 2. LXX; 3. Word Field. II. Images in Israel's Environs: 1. Mesopotamia; 2. Egypt. III. OT: 1. *ṣelem* as Pictorial Representation; 2. Human Beings as God's *ṣelem*. IV. Deuterocanonical Writings. V. Qumran.

ṣelem. C. Aldred, "Bild ('Lebendigkeit' eines Bildes)," *LexÄg*, I, 793ff.; A. Angerstorfer, "Gedanken zur Analyse der Inschrift(en) der Beterstatue vom Tel Fecherīye in *BN* 22 (1983) 91-106," *BN* 24 (1984) 7-11; idem, "Hebräisch *dmwt* und aramäisch *dmw(t)*: Ein Sprachproblem der Imago-Dei-Lehre," *BN* 24 (1984) 30-43; idem, "Gottebenbildlichkeit des Menschen bzw. des Königs — ein sumerisches Theologumenon?" *BN* 27 (1985) 7-10; J. Barr, "The Image of God in the Book of Genesis: A Study of Terminology," *BJRL* 51 (1968) 11-26; K.-H. Bernhardt, "Bild," *BHHW*, I, 249-50; idem, *Gott und Bild. ThArb* 2 (1956); H. Bonnet, "Bild," *RÄR*, 118-20; idem, "Kultbild," *RÄR*, 410-11; P. Bordreuil, "'À l'ombre d'Elohim': Le thème de l'ombre protectrice dans l'Ancien Orient et ses rapports avec 'L'Imago Dei,'" *RHPR* 46 (1966) 368-91; H. van den Bussche, "L'homme créé à l'image de Dieu," *Collationes Brugenses et Gandavenses* 31 (Brügge-Gent, 1948) 185-95; W. Caspari, "Imago divina," *FS Reinhold Seeberg*, I (Leipzig, 1929), 197-208; D. J. A. Clines, "The Image of God in Man," *TynB* 19 (1968) 53-103; idem, "The Etymology of Hebrew *Ṣelem*," *JNSL* 3 (1974) 19-25; P.-E. Dion, "Ressemblance et image du Dieu," *DBS*, X, 365-403; idem, "Image et ressemblance en araméen ancien," *Science et Esprit* 34 (Montreal/Tournai, 1982) 151-53; C. Dohmen, "Die Statue von Tell Fecherīje und die Gottebenbildlichkeit des Menschen: Ein Beitrag zur Bilderterminologie," *BN* 22 (1983) 91-106; J. Ebach, "Die Erschaffung des Menschen als Bild Gottes," *Pastoraltheologie: Wissenschaft und Praxis* 66 (1977) 198-214; G. Fohrer, "Theologische Züge des Menschenbildes im AT," *Studien zur alttestamentlichen Theologie und Geschichte. BZAW* 115 (1969), 176-94; K. Galling, *Das Bild vom Menschen in biblischer Sicht* (Mainz, 1947); idem, "Götterbild, weibliches," *BRL*², 111-19; B. Gemser, "Bilder und Bilderverehrung II. Im AT und NT," *RGG*³, I, 1271-73; M. Görg, "Alles hast du gelegt unter seine Füsse," *Freude an der Weisung des Herrn. FS H. Gross* (Stuttgart, ²1987), 125-48; idem, "Das Menschenbild in der Priesterschrift," *BiKi* 42 (1987) 21-29; H. Gross, "Die Gottebenbildlichkeit des Menschen," *Lex tua veritas. FS H. Junker* (Trier, 1961), 89-100; W. Gross, "Die Gottebenbildlichkeit des Menschen im Kontext der Priesterschrift," *TQ* 161 (1981) 244-64; J. Hehn, "Zum Terminus 'Bild Gottes,'" *FS E. Sachau* (Berlin, 1915), 36-52; W. Helck, "Kultstatue," *LexÄg*, III, 859-63; J. Hempel, *Gott, Mensch und Tier im AT mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Gen. 1–3. BZAW* 81 (1961), 198-229; S. Herrmann, "Die Naturlehre des Schöpfungsberichtes: Erwägungen zur Vorgeschichte von Genesis 1," *TLZ* 86 (1961) 413-24; idem, "'Gottebenbildlichkeit' — der Begriff und seine Funktion im Rahmen biblischer Theologie," *Innere Mission* 59 (1969) 280-87; E. Hornung, "Der Mensch als 'Bild Gottes' in Ägypten," in O. Loretz, ed., *Die Gottebenbildlichkeit des Menschen* (Munich, 1967), 123-56; F. Horst, "Der Mensch als Ebenbild Gottes," *Gottes Recht: Gesammelte Studien zum Recht im AT. ThB* 12 (1961), 222-34; P. Humbert, *Études sur le récit du paradis et de la chute dans la Genèse* (Neuchâtel, 1940); idem, "Trois notes sur Genèse 1," *Interpretationes ad VT Pertinentes. FS S. Mowinckel. NTT* 56 (1955) 85-96; G. A. Jónsson, *The Image of God: Genesis 1:26-28 in a Century of OT Research. CBOT* 26 (1988); L. Koehler, "Die Grundstelle der Imago-Dei-Lehre, Genesis 1,26," *TZ* 4 (1948) 16-22 = L. Scheffczyk, ed., *Der Mensch als Bild Gottes. WdF* 124 (1969), 3-9; H. M. Kümmel, "Bemerkungen zu den altorientalischen Berichten von der Menschenschöpfung," *WO* 7 (1973/74) 25-38; S. Lehming and J. Jervell, "Abbild, Ebenbild," *BHHW*, I, 4-5; S. E. Loewenstamm, *Comparative Studies in*

II. Images in Israel's Environs.

1. *Mesopotamia.* The Akk. *ṣalmu(m)* II (Hurr. *zalam*) means "statue, figure, image," and can refer more specifically to the statue of a god or king, to statuettes of supplicants, statues of demons, witches, sick persons, to reliefs or even flat pictures, figuratively to an astral image, something's form, or a likeness or paragon. It also occurs as the name of a deity.[17] The king can be called the likeness of a god.[18] The invocation priest can also be viewed as the likeness of a deity, in which case the allusion is clearly to his function.[19] The Sumerian terms for statue are *dùl, alam,* and *NU.*[20]

The statue of a god not only represents that god but is the living god itself.[21] In producing and consecrating statues of the gods, special rites such as opening the mouth were observed.[22]

Hehn and Maag, as well as others, originally drew attention to comparative material from Mesopotamia in understanding the notion of human beings made in the divine likeness.[23] Pettinato then thoroughly examined the material anew.[24] In a review of Pettinato's work, Kümmel concluded that the problem of such reference to human beings as the likeness of God was not yet sufficiently addressed.[25] The understanding of *zikru* as a "likeness" and thus of Enkidu's likeness to Anu seemed especially questionable.[26] Moreover, because Enkidu is a hero like Gilgamesh, statements about his creation do not necessarily also apply to the creation of human beings.[27]

2. *Egypt.* The understanding of images attested in Egyptian materials resembles that from Mesopotamia. The cultic statue of a god is the actual body in which that deity dwells.[28] Statues even of influential persons and of the pharaoh were understood as the locus of a hidden power, of the Ka, effected by the ritual of mouth opening and presentation of the person's name. One might mention especially the figurines of servants who were to serve their lord in the underworld, and the shawabti (ushabti) who freed the deceased from agricultural work in the realm of Osiris.[29] In the cult of the dead, the statue

---

17. *AHw,* III, 1078-79; *CAD,* XVI, 78-85; cf. S. Dalley, "The God Salmu and the Winged Disk," *Iraq* 48 (1986) 85-101.

18. *ABL,* 6:17; 55:4 (Neo-Assyrian); R. Campbell Thompson, *The Reports of the Magicians and Astrologers of Nineveh and Babylon in the British Museum* (London, 1900), 1705.2 (Neo-Babylonian).

19. See G. Meier, "Die zweite Tafel der Serie bīt mēseri," *AfO* 14 (1941/44) 150-51, ll. 225-26.

20. Renger, 307.

21. A. L. Oppenheim, *Ancient Mesopotamia* (Chicago, 1964; [2]1977), 183ff.; H. Ringgren, "The Symbolism of Mesopotamian Cult Images," *Religious Symbols and Their Functions. Scripta Instituti Donneriani Aboensis* 10 (Uppsala, 1979), 105-9.

22. Renger, 309, 312-13.

23. *AOT,* 134-35, 137, 205-6, 209; *ANET,* 100, 108.

24. See also Parpola, 98-99, 112-13; Loewenstamm, 48-49.

25. Kümmel, 30-31.

26. Gilg. 2 II 33. See Pettinato, 42.

27. See Angerstorfer, *BN* 27 (1985) 10; W. Gross, 247-48.

28. Helck, 859; cf. Bonnet, "Kultbild," *RÄR,* 410.

29. Aldred, 794.

in and of itself was the substitute body ensuring the continued existence of the deceased. Indeed, the magical power of this imagery involves the entire furnishings of the tomb, and the various pictorial representations were a living reality for the deceased.[30]

Hornung was the first to investigate systematically the rich and varied terminology associated with the understanding of human beings as the divine likeness.[31] Otto remained rather reserved in this regard, suggesting that the extremely dispersed and even sparse evidence about human beings as the likeness of the deity was actually referring to human ritual and moral capacity (Instruction of Ani),[32] and that the understanding attested by the Instruction of Meri-ka-Re was unique.[33] Ockinga then came to an extremely critical conclusion, suggesting that the terms *twt.w, ḥn.tỉ, šzp,* and *sšm.w* refer exclusively to the king as the concrete likeness of God, while the terms *znn, mỉ.tỉ* or *mỉtt* and *tỉ.t* refer to divine likeness with regard to a person's nature and behavior.[34] The understanding of human beings as the *znn.w* of god in the Instruction of Meri-ka-Re refers to divine likeness with regard to specific human characteristics.[35]

III. OT.

1. *ṣelem as Pictorial Representation.* The earliest OT witness for *ṣelem* is found in the ark narrative in 1 S. 6:5,11, which speaks of the images of boils and mice to be presented to Yahweh. By referring to these gifts as *'āšām,* "atonement offering," vv. 3-4 theologically reinterpret the original apotropaic function of this motif.[36]

Nu. 33:52 demands the destruction of all *ṣalmê massēḵôṯ,* "cast images," referring probably to idols. This text itself is strongly influenced by Dtr thinking.[37] 2 K. 11:18 par. 2 Ch. 23:17 recounts the destruction of Ba'al's temple in Jerusalem along with *ṣᵉlāmāyw,* "his images," actually a Dtr addendum to the text.[38]

Ezk. 7:20 accuses the Judeans of having made *ṣalmê tô'ᵃḇōṯām,* "abominable images."[39] Ezk. 16:17 accuses the Jerusalemites of having made *ṣalmê zāḵār,* "male images," with which they "played the whore," possibly a reference to phallic symbols.[40]

Ezk. 23:14 *Q* speaks of *ṣalmê kaśdîm,* "images of the Chaldeans," etched on a wall

---

30. Bonnet, "Bild," *RÄR,* 118-20; cf. S. Morenz, *Egyptian Religion* (Eng. trans. 1973), 150-56.

31. See also Wildberger, "Das Abbild Gottes."

32. On *myty* see Hornung, 128-31; also A. Volten, *Studien zum Weisheitsbuch des Anii* (Copenhagen, 1937), 161ff.; Hornung, 153.

33. Otto, 342-43. Meri-ka-Re text in *NERT,* 44-47 (trans. H. Brunner); also *ANET,* 414-18 (trans. J. A. Wilson).

34. Ockinga, 127-30.

35. Ockinga, 139-40; cf. also Westendorf, 37-38.

36. Wildberger, *TLOT,* III, 1081. Concerning text-critical questions, see H. J. Stoebe, *Das erste Buch Samuelis. KAT* VIII/1 (1973), 146-47, 150-51.

37. M. Noth, *Numbers. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1968), 248. Also → מסכה *massēḵâ,* VIII, 434.

38. E. Würthwein, *Die Bücher der Könige,* part II: *1. Kön. 17–2. Kön. 25. ATD* XI/2 (1984), 345, 348; W. Rudolph, *Chronikbücher. HAT* I/21 (1955), 271.

39. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), 199, 211.

40. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1,* 344; G. Fohrer, *Ezechiel. HAT* I/13 (²1955), 89; H. D. Preuss, *Verspottung fremder Religionen im AT. BWANT* 92 (1971), 177 n. 35.

with red coloring. The reference is probably to murals drawn with red lead,[41] and the reproach in vv. 14-16 seems to have been prompted by Jerusalem's political behavior.[42]

The text of Am. 5:26 is uncertain and represents a Dtr addendum. The expression *ṣalmêḵem,* "your images," refers probably to images of the Babylonian astral deities Kaiwan *(kayyamānû)*[43] and Sakkuth (Sum. *ᵈSAG.KUG*), both of which were manifestations of Saturn.[44] Redactors distorted both names with the vowels of *šiqqûṣ,* "abomination."[45] The reference is probably to processions with standards bearing the divine images.[46]

The difficulties attaching to Ps. 39:7(6) and 73:20 have prompted some scholars to assume the presence of a root *ṣlm* II, "become black, be dark," in both passages and to translate *ṣelem* here as "silhouette, fleeting shadow." This interpretation, however, is by no means certain.[47] In Ps. 39:7(6) *ṣelem* refers to a "dreamlike image."[48] Although the text in Ps. 73:20 is uncertain, it should probably be translated: "Like a dream upon awaking, they have disappeared, and at rising one scorns his phantom," referring to the immediate and harsh end of the wicked.[49]

In the Aramaic portion of the OT, the noun *ṣᵉlēm* (or *ṣelem* under Hebrew influence) occurs in Dnl. 2:31(bis),32,34,35 as a reference to the colossal statue in Nebuchadnezzar's vision representing the world order in the form of an empire.[50] It also occurs in 3:1,2,3(bis),5,7,10,12,14,15,18 in reference to the divine image erected by Nebuchadnezzar. Finally, in 3:19 the phrase *ṣᵉlēm 'anpôhî* refers to "the image of his face," "the expression of his face."[51]

This evidence shows that *ṣelem* was used especially during the exilic-postexilic period, and that the lexeme's basic meaning is "plastic [i.e., formative] replica," though it occasionally might also refer to a relief or picture. The word can also refer figuratively to a dream image, but cannot be viewed as a technical term for a cultic or divine image as such.[52]

2. *Human Beings as God's ṣelem.* The theologically most significant occurrences of *ṣelem* are in the primeval history (P: Gen. 1:26-27; 5:3; 9:6). The first consideration is

---

41. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1,* 486.

42. Preuss, *Verspottung,* 177.

43. See *AHw,* I, 420; *CAD,* VIII, 38.

44. E. Reiner, *Šurpu: A Collection of Sumerian and Akkadian Incantations. BAfO* 11 (1958), 18, l. 180; K.-H. Bernhardt, *BHHW,* I, 300; III, 1792-93.

45. W. Rudolph, *Joel, Amos, Obadja, Jona. KAT* XIII/2 (1971), 207; J. Jeremias, *Amos. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1998), 98, 105.

46. H. W. Wolff, *Joel and Amos. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1977), 265; cf. W. H. Schmidt, "Die deuteronomistische Redaktion des Amosbuches," *ZAW* 77 (1965) 188-91.

47. See I above.

48. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59,* 418.

49. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150,* 83-84, 89; differently Würthwein, *Wort und Existenz,* 169.

50. O. Plöger, *Das Buch Daniel. KAT* XVIII (1965), 52.

51. Ibid., 60.

52. In this regard see Bernhardt, *BHHW,* I, 249; idem, *Gott und Bild,* 67-68.

content of the notion of divine likeness that P actually mentions."[61] Zenger largely follows Gross and also accentuates the reference to the shepherd motif in Gen. 1:26b,28.[62] M. Görg modifies this interpretation in that human beings "in the 'image of God'" now assume the function of "God's spirit" over the chaos of the world (Gen. 1:2c),[63] though the interpretation of *rûaḥ ᵉlōhîm* seems problematic.[64]

The second model is similarly represented by various scholars,[65] though one might refer especially to Westermann, who first emphasizes that the motif of the creation of human beings in the image of a god belonged originally to an independent account of the creation of human beings; as such, the motif must also be comprehensible quite apart from the context of world creation.[66] Westermann concludes that "what God decides to create must be something that has a relationship to him." Ultimately, "this further determination in the account of creation of human beings . . . consists in determining further the nature of the act of creation which enables an event to take place between God and humans; it is not a question of a quality in human beings."[67] T. N. D. Mettinger advocates a rather peculiar thesis according to which the *imago* assertions articulate a relation between human beings and a heavenly prototype, just as the tabernacle was made according to a heavenly pattern or plan (*tabnîṯ;* cf. Ex. 25:9,40; 26:30; 27:8). On this view, *ṣelem* must refer to something between God and human beings, and the heavenly prototype for human beings is then the heavenly beings who carry out the worship service in the heavenly sanctuary.[68] This interpretation falters not least on the absence of the term *ṣelem* in the context of Ex. 25–27.[69] In his study of the Aramaic inscription on the statue at Tell Fekheriye, C. Dohmen suggests that *dmwt* there refers to the content of the image, to "that which is portrayed," while *ṣlm* refers to the external form, the "statue."[70] With regard to Gen. 1:26, Dohmen then concludes that the functional assertion intended there is composed of an element referring to God (*ṣelem:* human beings represent God in the world) and an element actually rendering God (*dᵉmûṯ:* human beings acquire the capacity to exercise this function by means of quasi-divine qualities).[71] Angerstorfer is justifiably skeptical toward this semantic differentiation between *ṣelem* and *dᵉmûṯ*.[72] Both terms refer to the statue of the supplicant and are interchangeable.[73]

---

61. W. Gross, 259.
62. Zenger, 86-90.
63. Görg, *FS H. Gross,* 146; cf. idem, *BiKi* 42 (1987) 25-26.
64. See R. Kilian, "Gen 1:2 und die Urgötter von Hermopolis," *VT* 16 (1966) 420-38.
65. W. Zimmerli, *1. Mose 12–25, Abraham. ZBK* I/2 (1976), 73; Stamm, "Imago-Lehre," 68; idem, *Gottebenbildlichkeit,* 19; Maag, *Kultur, Kulturkontakt,* 79, 85; Horst, 229-30; Galling, *Bild vom Menschen,* 12; Rudolph, "Das Menschenbild," 248-49; Loretz, *Gottebenbildlichkeit,* 63.
66. See R. Albertz, *Weltschöpfung und Menschenschöpfung. CThM* A/3 (1974), 54-90.
67. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11,* 157-58; idem, *TLOT,* I, 36.
68. Mettinger, 407, 410-11.
69. See Zenger, 85 n. 110.
70. Dohmen, 97.
71. Ibid., 100-101.
72. Angerstorfer, *BN* 24 (1984) 9-10.
73. Ibid., 33-35.

ate *wayyō'mer lāhem,* "he spoke to them," indicating that human beings are functioning as God's partners in dialogue. "The presupposition for God addressing human beings in this way is that [they] are created as God's counterpart, expressed in the assertion that they were created in the image of God."[85] This interpretation is also commensurate with 5:3, where Adam begets his son as his counterpart. "The relationship between God and human beings is continued in the relationship between father and son."[86] Finally, 9:6 discloses that human life is to be protected because human beings are God's counterpart.[87] Human beings as God's dialogue partner are thus also the only creatures capable of responding to God. At the level of humanity in its entirety, 1:26-27 lays the foundation for what happens from Gen. 17 P onward in God's history with the patriarchs and with Israel.

IV. Deuterocanonical Writings. Wis. 13:13,16; 14:15,17; 15:5 offer polemic against idols of the sort already found in the Hebrew OT (cf. Isa. 44:9-20) and paralleled in Hellenistic-Roman culture.[88] Wis. 14:15 and 17 represent an independent variation of the Hellenistic philosophical attempt to explain the worship of idols rationally.[89]

Wis. 17:21(20) speaks about the night as an image of future darkness. In antiquity, darkness was a widespread symbol for the inevitability of human death.[90] In 7:26 wisdom itself is called the image of God's perfection insofar as its own effects are divine.[91] This notion also constitutes the background to NT statements referring to Christ as the image of God (cf. Col. 1:15; Heb. 1:3).[92]

Finally, Wis. 2:23 refers to human beings as the image of God.[93] With its reference to Gen. 1:26-27, this passage (Wis. 2:23-24) asserts that although God intended human beings to have life in the fullest sense of the word, people are themselves capable of bringing about death, understood as a diminution of such life and ultimately as punishment.

The idea of human beings as the image of God is also articulated in Sir. 17:3 G. The attendant context shows that this image is manifested in the human capacity for cognition and reflection, a view reflecting a Hellenistic interpretation of Gen. 1:26-27.[94]

Based on this text, the understanding of human beings as the image of God in Judaism focuses on the formally understood element of *humanum,* i.e., on the human ca-

---

85. Ebach, 208.
86. Ibid., 210.
87. Contra W. Gross, 257-59.
88. See A. Schmitt, *Das Buch der Weisheit* (Würzburg, 1986), 116, 118-19.
89. D. Georgi, *Weisheit Salomos. JSHRZ* III/4 (1980), 452; cf. Preuss, *Verspottung,* 266.
90. Schmitt, *Weisheit,* 132.
91. G. Ziener, *Die theologische Begriffssprache im Buche der Weisheit. BBB* 11 (1956), 111.
92. Also Schmitt, *Weisheit,* 83.
93. Regarding this reading, see the opposing conclusion of Georgi, *Weisheit Salomos,* 409; Schmitt, *Weisheit,* 43.
94. See P. Casetti, *Gibt es ein Leben vor dem Tod? Eine Auslegung von Psalm 49. OBO* 44 (1982), 99.

pacity for ethical thinking and for free choice (cf. 2 En. 65:2). In the interpretation of history, the *imago* is the world dominion bequeathed to Adam and passed down to Israel as Adam's heir (4 Ezr. 6:54ff.; Jub. 2:14; 2 Bar. 14:18; 15:17). For Philo the logos as the mediator and revealer is also the image of God and the model for the human intellect.[95]

V. Qumran. In Qumran the root *ṣlm* occurs in CD 7:15,17 in the sense of "idol" (citing Am. 5:26).

Stendebach

95. Jervell, *BHHW,* I, 4; cf. Wildberger, *TLOT,* III, 1084.

צַלְמָוֶת *ṣalmāweṯ*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology; 2. Synonyms and Antonyms; 3. OT Distribution. II. Contexts: 1. Death and the Underworld; 2. Imprisonment; 3. Theological Language. III. LXX. IV. Qumran.

I. 1. *Etymology.* The subst. *ṣalmāweṯ* is an abstract construction deriving from *ṣālam* II, "be dark."[1] It is also related to Akk. *ṣalāmu,* "be/become black, dark," *ṣalmu,* "black," and *ṣulmu,* "blackness."[2] The subst. *ṣlmt* (also *ǵlmt, ẓlmt*) is also attested in Ugaritic with the meaning "darkness, gloom."[3] The divine messenger *Gpn w3gr* bears the title *bn ẓlmt* showing that he is the successor of the god of the underworld.[4] Additional witnesses from Northwest Semitic include the Punic subst. *ṣlmt* as a reference to

ṣalmāweṯ. J. Barr, "Philology and Exegesis," in C. Brekelmans, ed., *Questions disputées d'AT. BETL* 33 (1974), 39-61, esp. 50-55; D. J. A. Clines, "The Etymology of Hebrew *Ṣelem,*" *JNSL* 3 (1974) 19-25; I. H. Eybers, "The Root *Ṣ-L* in Hebrew Words," *JNSL* 2 (1972) 23-36; L. L. Grabbe, *Comparative Philology and the Text of Job: A Study in Methodology. SBLDS* 34 (1977), esp. 27-29, 52-54; J. Hehn, "צלמות," *MVÄG* 22 (1918) 79-90; W. L. Michel, "ṢLMWT, 'Deep Darkness' or 'Shadow of Death'?" *BR* 29 (1984) 5-20; S. Mittmann, "Aufbau und Einheit des Danklieds Psalm 23," *ZTK* 77 (1980) 1-23, esp. 9-10; T. Nöldeke, "צלמות und צלם," *ZAW* 17 (1897) 183-87; D. Winton Thomas, "צלמות in the OT," *JSS* 7 (1962) 191-200; N. J. Tromp, *Primitive Conceptions of Death and the Nether World in the OT. BietOr* 21 (1969), esp. 140-42.

1. *NSS,* 411 n. 3; *GesB,* 684.
2. *AHw,* III, 1076, 1078, 1110-11; *CAD,* XVI, 70-71, 77-78, 240-41.
3. *KTU* 1.4, VII, 54, 55; 1.8, II, 7-8; M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, "Untersuchungen zur Schrift- und Lautlehre des Ugaritischen (I). Der ugaritische Konsonant ǵ," *WO* 4 (1967/68) 308.
4. J. C. de Moor, *The Seasonal Pattern in the Ugaritic Myth of Ba'lu. AOAT* 16 (1971), 172.

darkness,[5] from Southwest Semitic Eth. *ṣalmat,* "darkness, gloom,"[6] and OSA *ẓlm* I, "darkness," "(the) west" or "black";[7] also Arab. *ẓalma,* "be gloomy, dark."

The Masoretic pointing of Heb. *ṣalmāwet* has resulted from popular folk etymology that understands it as "shadow of death."[8] Apart from the other Semitic witnesses militating against this popular etymology, one must also consider that the (in part) positively understood lexeme → צֵל *ṣēl* bears a negative connotation here.[9] On balance, however, attempts to understand *ṣalmāwet* in the sense of this popular folk etymology are unpersuasive.[10] The same applies to the suggestion that *ṣalmāwet* represents an intensive plural, "great darkness, gloom."[11]

2. *Synonyms and Antonyms.* The most frequent synonym for *ṣalmāwet* is → חֹשֶׁךְ *ḥōšek* (cf. Job 3:5; 10:21; 12:22; 28:3; 34:22; Ps. 107:10,14; Isa. 9:1[Eng. 2]). In such contexts *ḥōšek* is always the A-word in the parallelism, suggesting that *ṣalmāwet* as the B-word is rarer and derives from poetic language,[12] something the distribution of *ṣalmāwet* within the OT also demonstrates,[13] while *ḥōšek* also appears in narrative contexts.

The synonym *ḥōšek* as well as other parallels such as *'ōpel* (Job 28:3), *mᵉqôm tannîn* (Ps. 44:20[19]), *māwet* (Job 38:17), *'ᵃrāpel* (Jer. 13:16), and *ṣîyâ* (Jer. 2:6) clearly suggest that *ṣalmāwet* carries with it a negative connotation, something confirmed by the antonyms *bōqer* (Job 24:17; Am. 5:8) and *'ôr* (Job 12:22; Jer. 13:16). Accordingly, and unlike *ḥōšek,*[14] *ṣalmāwet* never refers to God's dwelling place.

3. *OT Distribution.* The 18 occurrences of *ṣalmāwet* are found in the prophets (Isa. 9:1[2]; Jer. 2:6; 13:16; Am. 5:8) and then 4 times in the Psalms and 10 in Job. As can be seen, the term does indeed occur only in poetic rather than narrative writings.

II. Contexts.

1. *Death and the Underworld.* In Job 10:21-22 *ṣalmāwet* refers to or characterizes the underworld.[15] The underworld is described here as *'ereṣ ḥōšek wᵉṣalmāwet* (v. 21),

---

5. *DNSI,* II, 966.

6. *LexLingAeth,* 1259.

7. Beeston, 172.

8. *HAL,* III, 1029b.

9. B. Kedar, *Biblische Semantik* (Stuttgart, 1981), 66. Regarding this restriction, see already Hehn, 82, who adduces the negative aspects of *ṣēl* as a symbol of that which is transitory or without substance or duration, or its connotation as a "sphere" (ibid., 83-84).

10. For an overview see Winton Thomas, 193, 196; Barr, 55; Michel, passim.

11. P. Haupt, "Die Schlacht von Taanach," *Studien zur semitischen Philologie und Religionsgeschichte. FS J. Wellhausen. BZAW* 27 (1914), 221.

12. See in general R. G. Boling, "'Synonymous' Parallelism in the Psalms," *JSS* 5 (1960) 221-25.

13. See I.3 below.

14. → חָשַׁךְ *ḥāšak,* V, 252 (III.3.c).

15. → שְׁאוֹל *šᵉ'ôl.*

recalling the use of *ḥōšek* in 1 S. 2:9; Job 15:30; 17:13, where it similarly refers to the underworld.[16]

The MT of Job 10:22 is corrupt and contains a doubling in *'ereṣ 'êpāṯâ kᵉmô 'ōpel ṣalmāweṯ* (*BHS:* homoioteleuton). Perhaps *ṣalmāweṯ* is to be supplied at the end of the verse,[17] or is to be deleted entirely given the concentration of terms for "darkness."[18]

Job 3:5 similarly uses *ṣalmāweṯ* in connection with the underworld. Here Job wishes that darkness and gloom might blot out the day he was born (*gā'al,* actually "claim" it) so that it sinks into the underworld. The parallelism *ša'ᵃrê ṣalmāweṯ* and *ša'ᵃrê māweṯ* in 38:17 focuses even more unambiguously on the underworld; these gates open only for the dead, which is why Job cannot possibly have seen them. The same applies to 28:3, where the expression "miners search out to the farthest bound the ore in gloom and deep darkness" means that the human intellect is able to penetrate even into the depths of the underworld.[19]

The "valley of gloomy darkness" *(gê' ṣalmāweṯ)* in Ps. 23:4 is not entirely clear; the use of *gay'* has prompted some interpreters to understand the valley of darkness as the valley of idolatry.[20] The counterpart to *gê' ṣalmāweṯ* is the *ma'gᵉlê ṣeḏeq* (v. 3), a reference to the path that does not lead a person astray.[21] Reference to the valley of darkness not only evokes the notion of dark or gloomy places in general, but also symbolizes the ultimate threat to human existence, namely, death.[22] In Isa. 9:1(2) the expressions *hālaḵ bᵉḥōšeḵ* and *yāšaḇ bᵉ'ereṣ ṣalmāweṯ* are parallel. The construct relation *'ereṣ ṣalmāweṯ* in a sequence of several *nomina recta* to *'ereṣ* also appears as *nomen regens* in Jer. 2:6 and Job 10:21.[23] Job 10:21 refers to the underworld, while Jer. 2:6 refers to the inhospitable nature of the wilderness as *'ereṣ ṣîyâ wᵉṣalmāweṯ*. This description characterizes the wilderness as precreation chaos associated with the motifs of darkness and the utter absence of human beings.[24] The term *ṣalmāweṯ* conjures up the notion of death caused by the thirst and hunger to which the wanderer is subject.[25] Isa. 9:1(2) is further illuminated by Ps. 107:10 *(yōšᵉḇê ḥōšeḵ wᵉṣalmāweṯ),* where, as the parallelism *'ᵃsîrê 'ᵒnî ûḇarzel* shows, the terms *ḥōšeḵ* and *ṣalmāweṯ* refer to imprisonment. Compared with Job 10:21 and Ps. 107:10, however, Isa. 9:1(2) does not make clear whether it refers to imprisonment or to the underworld.[26] This particular terminology was chosen to show how closely imprisonment resembles life in the underworld.

---

16. → חשך *ḥāšaḵ,* V, 255-56 (IV.4).
17. F. Horst, *Hiob 1 (1–19). BK* XVI/1 (⁴1983), 142.
18. G. Hölscher, *Das Buch Hiob. HAT* I/17 (²1952), 30; G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 201.
19. Hehn, 88.
20. J. A. Soggin, "'Your Conduct in the Valley': A Note on Jeremiah 2,23a," *OT and Oriental Studies. BietOr* 29 (1975), 79-80; but cf. *GesB,* 212.
21. Mittmann, 8.
22. Ibid., 10.
23. See *GK,* §128a; JM, §129b.
24. H. Weippert, *Schöpfer des Himmels und der Erde. SBS* 102 (1981), 51-54, here 54.
25. Hehn, 85.
26. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12* (Eng. trans. 1991), 395.

Job 16:16 is similarly obscure in its assertion that Job's face is red with weeping and that *ṣalmāweṯ* is on his eyelids. Is this statement merely pointing out the difference between weeping eyes and the radiant gaze of a joyous person? Has Job "descended into darkness," a reference to his ultimate isolation? Or is death already upon him?[27]

2. *Imprisonment.* Ps. 44:20(19) uses *ṣalmāweṯ* in its exilic description of the fall of Jerusalem and parallel to its description of the city as the haunt of jackals (cf. Isa. 34:13; Jer. 9:10[11]; Lam. 5:18). The reference to the exiles themselves as prisoners in Ps. 107:10 (see previous section) also dates to the exilic period. By contrast, being led out of darkness and gloom can also refer to broken chains and liberation from prison.

3. *Theological Language.* Like everything else in creation, the sphere qualified as *ṣalmāweṯ* is subject to Yahweh's ultimate power. He has the power to turn deep darkness into morning (Am. 5:8) and to bring deep darkness to light (Job 12:22). Similarly, because darkness cannot endure before Yahweh, the wicked cannot hope to hide before him in darkness (Job 24:17; 34:22). Yahweh can also act quite contrary to his creation activities (Am. 5:8; Job 12:22), however, when he turns light into gloom and deep darkness for the arrogant (Jer. 13:16).

III. LXX. In 11 passages the LXX follows the popular folk etymology in rendering *ṣalmāweṯ* as *skiá thanátou.* It uses simply *skiá* in Job 16:16, *gnopherós* in 10:21, and translates directly as *hádēs* in 38:17. It paraphrases the term in 34:22 and Jer. 2:6.[28]

IV. Qumran. Of the 2 occurrences of *ṣalmāweṯ* in Qumran, 4Q509 189:3 is of little help because of its corrupt text. 1QH 13(5):32-33 mentions how the petitioner's adversaries have enclosed him in darkness. Here *ṣalmāweṯ* refers metaphorically to the distress into which the petitioner comes, providing an antithesis to the broad expanse *(merḥāḇ)* Yahweh brings him.

Niehr

27. In turn: Horst, *Hiob 1,* 251; H. Gross, *Ijob. NEB* 13 (1986), 64; Hehn, 86-87.
28. See Winton Thomas, 191; concerning the difficulties in Job 10:22, see ibid., n. 5.

II. Meaning.

1. *"Rib" in Gen. 2:21b-22.* The two earliest occurrences come from the hand of the Yahwist, according to whom Yahweh creates the first woman by taking one *(ṣēlāʿ) miṣṣalʿōṯ* of Adam and making it *(bānâ)* into a woman (Gen. 2:21b-22). Various interpretive attempts have adduced relationships from mythology, the history of religions, anthropology, etc. This passage is also a *locus classicus* for feminist theology insofar as it can be interpreted as an expression of a lesser, equal, or higher valuation of women.

Most of the interpretive attempts can be classified among the following:

a. Etiological interpretations suggest that 2:21-22 explains the origin of the navel in even the first human being (P. Humbert), the absence of ribs in the stomach area (K. Budde, W. Zimmerli), or the unexplainable urge to pair with the opposite sex (H. Gunkel, G. von Rad).

b. Mythological interpretations find behind 2:21-22 the mythical notion about how the (crescent) moon came to be a symbol of fertility,[8] or they identify echoes of the Sumerian Dilmum myth according to which the healing goddess Ninti, "mistress of the rib/of life" (cf. 3:20), was formed from the rib of Enki.[9]

c. Anthropological interpretations understand the rib as a reference to the ape tail of early human beings.[10]

d. Associative interpretations variously believe the "rib" stands for the slender female figure (so H. Schmidt, in K. Budde), the crescent moon (O. Schilling), the procreative organ,[11] a "side" for the female breast,[12] or, given its proximity to the heart, for human inwardness.[13] Two hypotheses are based on linguistic associations. One asserts that J chose *ṣēlāʿ* because of the Sumerian homonym *TI,* "life," "rib,"[14] another that J picked up the Akk. etymon *ṣēlu,* "life," to explain Eve's destiny as the "mother of all living" (3:20).[15] This wordplay, however, does not work in Hebrew, nor can any relationship with the Dilmun myth be demonstrated.

e. Metaphorical interpretations suggest, e.g., that because the rib is not an essential body part, creating the woman from a rib did not disfigure the human person or change human nature.[16] A. Dillmann suggests that the meaning is that the woman stands at a

---

8. O. Schilling, *Das Mysterium Lunae und die Erschaffung der Frau* (Paderborn, 1963).

9. See S. N. Kramer, *The Sumerians* (Chicago, 1963), 149; *ANET,* 37ff.

10. According to T. Moore: see W. Vogels, "It is not good that the mensch [sic] should be alone. I will make him/her a helper fit for him/her," *EgT* 9 (1978) 29.

11. A. S. Feilschuss-Abir, "Erschaffung, Bestimmung und Stellung der Frau in der Urgeschichte in anthropologischer Sicht," *Theologie und Glaube* 76 (1986) 403.

12. V. Notter, *Biblischer Schöpfungsbericht und ägyptische Schöpfungsmythen. SBS* 68 (1974), 168-69.

13. J. Skinner, *Genesis. ICC* (²1951), 68; M. Bič, *Vom Geheimnis und Wunder der Schöpfung. BSt* 25 (1959), 50.

14. See Kramer, *Sumerians,* 149; also C. Hauret, *DBS,* VI, 921-22; C. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11* (Eng. trans. 1984), 230.

15. See P. Jordan, *Die Töchter Gottes* (Frankfurt am Main, 1973), 11 n. 5.

16. O. Procksch, *Die Genesis. KAT* I (³1924), 39; E. Haag, *Der Mensch am Anfang: Die alttestamentliche Paradiesvorstellung nach Gn 2–3. TTS* 24 (1970), 47.

man's side and fills a void.[17] Evaluating the rib as a nonessential part of the body reveals the antifemale component of this interpretation.

f. The psychological interpretation already suggested by F. Schwally and then enthusiastically embraced by feminist interpreters, namely, that 2:21-22 reflects the splitting of the androgynous primal human being and its sexual differentiation, is utterly inaccessible to genuine exegetical assessment.[18]

Virtually all these hypotheses presuppose that *ṣēlā'* does indeed mean "rib." The only certain thing, however, is that if *ṣēlā'* does mean "rib," it does so only in this one passage. This semantic singularity, of course, suggests that one seek a different solution. Four considerations are of significance in this regard.

First, nearly all these hypotheses isolate 2:21b-22 from its context. Because for literary-critical reasons these verses cannot be extracted from the Yahwistic context, they are to be understood as a correlation to the creation of the (definite) figure of Adam from the "dust of the ground" (v. 7), even if this creation itself was already contained in a source, accessible to J, involving the creation of (indefinite) "human beings" (without sexual differentiation).[19]

Second, the structural similarity between v. 7 *(wayyiṣer . . . 'āpār min-hā'ᵃdāmâ wayyippaḥ . . . lᵉnepeš)* and vv. 21b-22 *(wayyiqqaḥ 'aḥaṯ miṣṣal'ōṯāyw . . . wayyiḇen . . . lᵉ'iššâ)* suggests that these two creation statements from J are more closely related.

Third, the verb *bānâ* in v. 22 has attracted considerable attention in connection with the creation of human beings; even though this verb does indeed express basic creative capabilities,[20] it is not otherwise used in this context. The presence of this verb has prompted several reactions, including the following.

Fourth, some interpreters understand *ṣēlā'* here too as a term from sacral architecture. The relationship formula in v. 23a, also to be ascribed to J, suggests on the one hand that *ṣēlā'* refers to a (bony) human body part, while on the other hand J himself sensed that this particular semantic component was not necessarily comprehensible to all readers, which is why in v. 23a he speaks about *'eṣem,* "bones," suggesting that even during the early monarchy, *ṣēlā'* was understood primarily as a term from sacral architecture. Even if the architectural term itself is not unequivocal,[21] it does refer to side portions of the sanctuary that are essential for its stability and function.

J has thus portrayed the creation of man and woman in terminology designed to evoke associations with the construction of the sanctuary. The Yahwist's intention is twofold. Theologically the Yahwist suggests that human beings come to the fulfillment for which they are destined by creation only as man and wife and as "God's temple"

---

17. Dillmann, *Genesis,* 2 vols. (Eng. trans. 1897), I, 143.

18. F. Schwally, "Die biblischen Schöpfungsberichte," *ARW* 9 (1906) 174-75; cf. Jordan, *Töchter Gottes,* 14; P. Trible, *God and the Rhetoric of Sexuality. OBT* (1978), 97.

19. Concerning the literary-critical issues here, see C. Dohmen, *Schöpfung und Tod: Die Entfaltung theologischer und anthropologischer Konzeptionen in Gen. 2/3. SBB* 17 (1988).

20. → בנה *bānâ (bānāh),* II, 167-68, 173-74.

21. See II.2 below.

(cf. 1 Cor. 3:16).[22] During his own age, the Yahwist is also responding to the anticipated construction of the temple of Solomon.

2. *As a Specialized Term in Sacral Architecture.* As a term associated with sacral architecture, *ṣēlā'* is no less disputed, though it certainly shares this problem with all such specialized terminology.

a. *Solomon's Temple.* 1 Kings 6–7[23] especially presents problems. The unique plural form ending in *-îm* in v. 34 remains unexplained. Although reading *qᵉlā'îm,* "carvings," as in the parallel half-verse instead of *ṣᵉlā'îm* yields a more cogent sentence,[24] all the ancient versions disagree. Broad consensus holds that in 1 K. 6:15-16 *ṣᵉlā'ôṯ* refers to planks or boards associated with the wall coverings or floor.[25]

Various interpretations have been presented for 1 K. 6:5-8 (the temple) and 7:3 (the House of the Forest of Lebanon).

Some interpreters combine the information from 1 K. 6–7 with that from Ezk. 41 to arrive at the meaning "chamber" or "upper story" (implying the presence of chambers). On this view the temple had a three-story construction *(yāṣîa')* subdivided into chambers (side rooms).[26]

Noth comes to a similar conclusion without adducing Ezk. 41.[27] According to 1 K. 6:6a,8, *ṣᵉlā'ôṯ* refers to a three-story system of open galleries around the outer walls of the building.

Hentschel[28] and Rupprecht similarly find the meaning "adjacent story/floor" in 6:5-8 but assume that this description of the new construction *(yāṣîa')* represents a literary addendum that in its own turn refers to alterations to the temple from a later period.[29] V. 7 then describes the architectural connection between this adjacent secondary building and the temple *(bayiṯ)* itself.

The various meanings of *ṣēlā'* within a relatively brief textual section prompted Mulder to try to establish a single meaning for *ṣᵉlā'ôṯ.* He suggests the presence of beams or girders supporting the building's walls in the fashion of "buttresses." The problem in 6:8, however, is that this view presupposes a door in the central buttress, which is highly unlikely.

The semantic variations are similar regarding *ṣēlā'* in the description of the House of the Forest of the Lebanon (7:3). Busink believes that it had an upper story, while

---

22. Bič, 49.

23. With E. Würthwein, *Das erste Buch der Könige 1–16. ATD* 11/1 (1976), Hentschel, and others, all occurrences of *ṣēlā'* with the exception of 1 K. 6:8 can be ascribed to the pre-Dtr text.

24. See M. Noth, *Könige 1–16. BK* IX/1 (²1983), 102; Michel, 56.

25. Noth, ibid., 118-19, takes a different view, suggesting instead that the reference is to a large wooden frame filled out with boards.

26. See Busink, 133, 212-13; M. Rehm, *Das erste Buch der Könige* (Würzburg, 1979), 64, 74; Würthwein, *Könige 1–16,* 63, 71; similarly J. Gray, *I & II Kings. OTL* (²1970), 164-65, 177-78.

27. *Könige 1–16,* 98, 112-16.

28. "Zum Bau," esp. pp. 18-24; see idem, *1 Könige. NEB* (1984), 43.

29. Rupprecht, 50; Fritz, 14.

surements of the first (and second?) temple in the wilderness sanctuary. The *miškān* is to be made portable by having the walls of its "sides" *(ṣᵉlā'ōṯ)* made of individual planks (Ex. 26:20,26-27; 36:25,31-32). The lampstand is to be set up at its "south side" *(ṣēlā' hammiškān têmānâ),* and the table at its "north side" *(ṣela' ṣāpôn)* (Ex. 26:35).

The altar of burnt offering, which, as 38:7 adds, was made of boards *(luḥôṯ),*[34] is also equipped with support rings (27:7; 38:7). As a final touch insuring the portability of the wilderness sanctuary, the incense altar was also equipped with carrying rings on its sides *(ṣal'ōṯāyw)* par. "on its two sides" *('al-šᵉnê ṣiddāyw)* (30:4; 37:27).

III. LXX. The LXX similarly did not find the term *ṣēlā'* to be semantically unequivocal. It frequently renders Gen. 2:21-22; 1 K. 6–7; and Ezk. 41 in a fairly neutral fashion with *pleurón/pleurá* (17 times), "side," which for Gen. 2:21-22 constitutes an interesting early reading. The occurrences in P are generally rendered as *klítos* (9 times). In Ezk. 41:11 the LXX accommodates its rendering by translating *exédra* (which is otherwise only used for *liškâ*). It translates *ṣēlā' hāhār* in 2 S. 16:13 as *pleurá toú órous,* "mountain flank."

The term has not yet occurred in the Qumran writings.

Fabry

34. → לוּחַ *lûaḥ,* VII, 480-83.

צָמֵא *ṣāmē';* צָמָא *ṣāmā';* צִמְאָה *ṣim'â;* צִמָּאוֹן *ṣimmā'ôn*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences and Meaning. II. OT Use: 1. Daily Life; 2. The Thirst of the Dead; 3. Thirst as God's Punishment; 4. Metaphorical Use. III. 1. LXX; 2. Qumran.

I. 1. *Etymology.* The root *ṣm',* "to thirst," is attested in Akkadian, Ugaritic, and in addition to Hebrew and Middle Hebrew especially in the South Semitic languages. Aramaic uses the root *ṣhy* instead of *ṣm'.*

Akkadian evidence includes *ṣamû,* "to thirst," e.g., for beer; in the D stem "make thirsty," e.g., people or horses; also *ṣamû,* "thirsty," *ṣummû* or *ṣūmu,* "thirst," *ṣum-*

ṣāmē'. J. Behm and G. Bertram, "διψάω, δίψος," *TDNT,* II, 226-29; V. Hasler, "Durst," *BHHW,* I, 358; A. Hermann, "Durst," *RAC,* IV, 389-415; A. Parrot, "Le 'Refrigerium' dans l'eau-delà," *RHR* 113 (1936) 149-87; 114 (1936) 69-92, 158-96; 115 (1937) 53-89; A. M. Schneider, "Refrigerium" (diss., Freiburg, 1928); A. J. van Windekens, "L'origine de gr. δίψα 'soif,'" *Orbis* 22 (1973) 186-87.

āmītu, "thirst" in topographical names (cf. Heb. *ṣimmāʾôn*), or said of troops or of the dead.[1] Ugaritic evidence attests only (once each) *ġmʾ* and *ẓmʾ* in the sense of "to thirst," specifically *ġmu ġmìt* in a question El poses to ʾAtirat (Asherah), "Art thou become hungry and faint, or art become thirsty and parched?"[2] and *mẓmʾ yd mṯkt*, "The parched she [probably ʿAnat] takes by the hand."[3] The Arabic root is *ẓamiʾa*, "to thirst," *ẓimʾ*, *ẓamaʾ*, *ẓamā*, "thirst," *ẓamʾān* and *ẓamiʾ*, "thirsty." Ethiopic evidence includes Geez *ṣamʾa*, "to thirst," *ṣēmʾ*, "thirst," and *ṣĕmūʾ*, "thirsty,"[4] while in Tigre we find *ṣamʾa*, "to thirst," *ṣemeʾ*, "thirst," *ṣemuʾ*, "thirsty"; cf. *medr ṣemeʾ*, "desolate, arid land."[5] Old South Arabic includes Sab. *ṣmʾ* alongside *ẓmʾ*.[6]

2. *Occurrences and Meaning.* The root *ṣmʾ* with its derivatives occurs 40 times in the OT, including 12 times in Isaiah and 6 in the Psalms. The verb *ṣmʾ* occurs 10 times in the qal, the subst. *ṣāmāʾ* 17 times, and the adj. *ṣāmēʾ* 9 times. The noun *ṣimʾâ* also occurs once (Jer. 2:25) in the sense of "thirst," and the construction *ṣimmāʾôn* 3 times (Dt. 8:15; Ps. 107:33; Isa. 35:7) in the sense of "parched, waterless region." With the exception of Isaiah, the broad distribution of this root throughout the various OT books suggests that no one author had a particular inclination to use the term.

At least in Job 5:5 (cf. the versions), *ṣᵉmēʾîm* is to be read instead of *ṣammîm*. In Job 18:9 Origen *(sub ast.: katischýsei ep' autón dipsṓntas)* similarly presupposes *ṣᵉmēʾîm*, though here too the parallelism would rather suggest *ṣammîm*, "trap" in the sense of "snare."[7] In Jer. 48:18 one should probably follow Syriac and read *baṣṣōʾâ*, "down from your glory and sit *in the dung*," instead of MT *baṣṣāmāʾ*, "in thirst."

II. OT Use.

1. *Daily Life.* Constituting 55-60 percent of a person's body weight, water is the main component of the human body. Wherever heat and lack of water turn a region into *ṣimmāʾôn*, a "land of thirst" or a wilderness (Dt. 8:15; Ps. 107:33; Isa. 35:7), finding enough to drink becomes a critical issue (cf. Ex. 17:3). In hotter climates a person can lose, and to avoid health risks must accordingly also replace, up to twelve liters of water a day. The lack of water is thus even more dangerous than the lack of food. A person

---

1. *AHw*, 1081, 1111-12; *CAD*, XVI, 95-96, 243-44, 245-46, 247-48.
2. *KTU* 1.4, IV, 34; *ANET*, 133a, ll. 33-34.
3. *KTU* 1.15, I, 2; *ANET*, 145b; O. Rössler, "Ghain im Ugaritischen," *ZA* 54 (1961) 163, thinks *ġmʾ* is a scribal error; a different view is taken by W. von Soden, "Kleine Beiträge zum Ugaritischen und Hebräischen," *Hebräische Wortforschung. FS W. Baumgartner. SVT* 16 (1967), 293-94.
4. *LexLingAeth*, 1271-72.
5. *WbTigr*, 635.
6. See Beeston, 143, 172; Biella, 227, 425; concerning the alternation of *ṣ* and *ẓ* in later Sabaic, see A. F. L. Beeston, *Sabaic Grammar. JSS Monograph* 6 (1984), §2.1, p. 8.
7. Concerning Job 5:5, see E. F. Sutcliffe, "Notes on Job, Textual and Exegetical," *Bibl* 30 (1949) 67. Concerning Origen's reading and critical apparatus *("sub ast.")*, see A. Rahlfs, "History of the Septuagint Text," *Septuaginta* (Stuttgart, 1935), XXVIII-XXIX (introductory material).

I. 1. *Etymology.* The Heb. term *ṣmḥ,* "to sprout," corresponds to Ugar. *ṣmḫ,* the verbal form of which occurs only as a personal name, while the substantive means "sprout."[1] The root also occurs as Phoen. and Pun. *ṣmḥ,* "offspring, scion,"[2] and as Jewish Aram. *ṣᵉmaḥ,* (subst. *ṣimḥā',* "sprout, growth"). The Syr. *ṣᵉmaḥ* means both "to sprout" and "to glow" (*ṣemḥā',* "radiance, sprout"), while Mand. *ṣhm, ṣma,* means only "to glow, shine."[3] There is probably no connection with Akk. *šamāḫu,* which is generally associated with *śmḥ.*[4]

2. *Occurrences.* The verb *ṣāmaḥ* occurs 33 times in the OT, including 15 times in the qal (also once in Sirach), 14 in the hiphil, and 4 in the piel; the subst. *ṣemaḥ* occurs 12 times (also once in Sirach). Of the 45 occurrences of the root, 10 are found in Isaiah, 6 each in Genesis and Ezekiel, and 5 in the Psalms.

II. OT.

1. *Verb.* The verb is associated first of all with the life of plants. The J creation account in Genesis describes the primal state of the world when "no plant of the field was yet in the earth and no herb *('ēśeḇ)* of the field had yet sprung up" because it had not yet rained (Gen. 2:5, qal). Yahweh then causes every sort of tree to grow from the ground *('ᵃḏāmâ)* (2:9, hiphil). Hence the sprouting forth of plants is one of God's creative acts. By contrast, after the Fall the cursed ground will bring forth only thorns and thistles (3:18). In his dream Pharaoh sees seven plump and good ears of grain and seven thin and blighted ears growing up (41:6,23; *'ālâ* is used in reference to the strong, beautiful ears, vv. 5,22). The plagues in Egypt include the locusts that devour every tree "that grows in the field" (*ṣōmēaḥ,* Ex. 10:5). Qoheleth boasts of having made pools from which to water the sprouting trees he planted (Eccl. 2:6). Ezekiel describes Zedekiah as a vine that Nebuchadnezzar, portrayed as an eagle, plants and that "sprouts" forth with branches but then stretches out its roots toward another eagle (i.e., Egypt; Ezk. 17:6). This disloyalty can only lead to disaster; the vine is pulled up by its roots, and its sprouting shoots wither where it once grew forth (*ṣmḥ,* vv. 9-10).

The hiphil forms are also used several times in the literal sense. Dt. 29:22(Eng. 23) announces that if the covenant is broken, the land will be devastated such that it cannot be planted *(zr'),* nor will it make anything sprout forth (*ṣmḥ,* hiphil); indeed, not a single blade of grass will grow *('ālâ).* According to Ps. 104:14, God's creative care makes grass grow for cattle and plants grow for people (*ṣmḥ,* hiphil). In his first discourse to Job, God similarly emphasizes that he sends the rain to quench the desert and to "make the ground put forth grass" (Job 38:27). Ps. 147:8 extols God for sending the rain and making the grass grow on the hills. Deutero-Isaiah then uses this fact to portray the power of God's word. Just as the rain and snow make the earth bring forth growth, so

---

1. The verb in *PNU,* 59, 189; the subst. in *PRU,* II, 7, 9, cj. *KTU* 1.19, I, 17; cf. M. Dijkstra and J. C. de Moor, "Problematic Passages in the Legend of Aqhâtu," *UF* 7 (1975) 199.

2. *DNSI,* II, 970; see below.

3. *MdD,* 390.

4. Concerning the overlapping between *ṣmḥ* and *śmḥ,* see Greenfield and Grossberg.

also shall God's word "not return to me empty" (Isa. 55:10-11). Trito-Isaiah uses a similar image in asserting that just as the earth brings forth its shoots *(ṣemaḥ),* and a garden "causes what is sown in it to spring up" (*ṣmḥ,* hiphil), so also will Yahweh cause "righteousness" to sprout forth (hiphil, metaphorically; 61:11, referring back to the "seed whom Yahweh has blessed," i.e., Israel [v. 9]).

In a more general sense, *ṣmḥ* refers to the growth of hair (Lev. 13:27) or of healing skin (Isa. 58:8, metaphorically). The piel refers in a similarly metaphorical fashion to the "growth" of Samson's hair (Jgs. 16:22), of a young woman's (i.e., Jerusalem's) hair (Ezk. 16:7), and to the beards of David's envoys defiled by the Ammonites (2 S. 10:5 par. 1 Ch. 19:5).

In a purely metaphorical sense, *ṣāmaḥ* can also be said of people. One person dies, and another springs forth from the earth (Job 8:19; cf. Sir. 14:18, which asserts that the generations are like leaves sprouting forth on trees: "one dies and another matures [*gāmal*]"). In Deutero-Isaiah God promises his servant Israel that he will "pour water on the thirsty land" so that Israel's descendants "shall spring up like willows by flowing streams" (Isa. 44:4, preserving thus the association with the plant world). Abstract notions can also "spring up," e.g., faithfulness (Ps. 85:12[11], par. righteousness from heaven), trouble (Job 5:6), the new things in Deutero-Isaiah (Isa. 42:9; 43:19), and perhaps salvation itself, albeit not explicitly mentioned (Zech. 6:12).

The hiphil twice takes the obj. → קֶרֶן *qeren,* "horn." According to Ps. 132:17, Yahweh "will cause a horn to sprout up for David" and has prepared *('āraḵ)* "a lamp[5] for my anointed one." The horn symbolizes power, particularly that of the king, or even the king himself, while the lamp refers to the stability of the dynasty. Ezekiel picks up this imagery and associates it with Israel, asserting that the people will receive new power (Ezk. 29:21). It is less likely that the reference here is to a messianic figure; the expression is rather alluding to "approaching deliverance for Israel."[6] In his "last words," David acknowledges that because of the covenant, Yahweh caused his *yēšaʿ* and all his *ḥēpeṣ* to sprout forth (2 S. 23:5),[7] i.e., Yahweh has made him successful and fulfilled all his wishes. This passage may also allude to the dynasty. According to Isa. 45:8, Yahweh's creative power *(bārāʾ)* will cause salvation *(yēšaʿ)* and righteousness to sprout up. The imagery of righteousness raining down from heaven and the skies completes the metaphor from the world of plants (*rʿp, nzl;* concerning this imagery, cf. Ps. 72:6-7 with *māṭār* and *pāraḥ*). Concerning Jer. 33:15, see below.

2. *ṣemaḥ.* The subst. *ṣemaḥ* refers to that which sprouts, i.e., "growth." The rain of sulfur and fire on Sodom and Gomorrah also destroys all plants and "growth" on the ground (Gen. 19:25). By contrast, God softens the field with rain and blesses its growth (Ps. 65:11[10], an allusion to the vivifying autumnal rains). God's salvific work is compared to the sprouting of new growth (Isa. 61:11; see above), and prosperous Jerusalem

5. → נֵר *nēr,* X, 14-24.

6. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1983), 120.

7. Concerning textual questions, see T. N. D. Mettinger, "The Last Words of David," *SEÅ* 41-42 (1976-77) 153-54.

with the sprouting plants of the field (Ezk. 16:7). Sir. 40:22 praises the beauty of green shoots. Hosea asserts in the fashion of a proverb that those who sow the wind will reap the whirlwind, and that sprouts without heads will yield no meal (Hos. 8:7), i.e., that Israel's idolatry accomplishes nothing, particularly not the intended fertility; indeed, it has even worse consequences in that Israel's enemies will devour the growth of the field.

In Jeremiah and Zechariah, *ṣemaḥ* has become a messianic title. According to Jer. 23:5, Yahweh will raise up for David a *ṣemaḥ ṣaddîq* who will reign as king and execute justice and righteousness. He will be called *yhwh ṣidqēnû* (v. 6). With regard to the expression *ṣemaḥ ṣaddîq,* one might mention the expression *ṣmḥ ṣdq* in a 3d-century Phoenician inscription with the meaning "legitimate sprout, legal heir."[8] The reference is thus to a legitimate ruler from the Davidic dynasty, and the name obviously alludes to Zedekiah; this ruler will actualize much more effectively than did Zedekiah the royal ideal expressed in the name. The oracle is reinterpreted in 33:15-16, though here the name "Yahweh is our righteousness" is transferred to Jerusalem.

In Zechariah the term *ṣemaḥ* has become a technical term. In Zech. 3:8 Yahweh promises to bring his servant "the Branch," and 6:12-13 then speaks of a man whose name is *ṣemaḥ* and under whose feet it (salvation) will sprout forth; he will also rebuild Yahweh's temple and rule on his throne. Although the original version probably referred to Zerubbabel, the same redactor who inserted the reference to the high priest Joshua also eliminated this reference.

The expression *ṣemaḥ yhwh* in Isa. 4:2 (late) is unclear. The text says that "on that day the branch of Yahweh shall be beautiful and glorious." Although a messianic interpretation is evident even in the early Tg. and is also advocated by many Jewish and Christian interpreters, it is difficult to carry through. The parallel expression *p^erî hā'āreṣ* suggests that the reference is to the rich harvest of the land in the coming age of salvation, though one might note that salvation and righteousness are often closely associated in such contexts.[9]

III. 1. *LXX.* The LXX generally renders the verb *ṣmḥ* with *anatéllein* or *exanatéllein,* occasionally also with *blastánein* (also *ana-* or *ekblastánein*) or *(ana-) phýein.* It usually renders *ṣemaḥ* as *anatolḗ,* in Gen. 19:25 as *anatéllonta,* and in Isa. 61:11 as *ánthos.* In Isa. 4:2 the LXX reads a verb and translates *epilámpsein,*[10] while it paraphrases Hos. 8:7. Jer. 33:15 is missing from the LXX.

2. *Qumran.* The verb *ṣmḥ* occurs only twice in the Qumran texts, the noun *ṣemaḥ* 3 times. The Damascus Document (CD 1:7) says that 390 years after Nebuchadnezzar, God "caused a plant root to spring [hiphil] from Israel and Aaron" (an allusion to Isa. 60:21 with *šōreš* instead of *nēṣer*), apparently referring to the community of the new covenant. 4Q185 1:10 speaks of the sprouting grass (cf. Isa. 40:6ff.).

---

8. *KAI* 43.11; → צדק *ṣādaq.*

9. O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 1–12. OTL* (Eng. trans. ²1983), 85-86.

10. See I.1 above.

By contrast, *ṣemaḥ dāwiḏ* is clearly a messianic term (Moraldi). 4QPBless 1:3 speaks of the anointed one of righteousness, the branch of David to whom the covenant of kingship will be bestowed (an allusion to Gen. 49:10). 4QFlor 1:11 provides a commentary on 2 S. 7:8-14, saying "he is the Branch of David who shall arise with the Interpreter of the Law to rule in Zion at the end of time." Finally a fragment of a commentary on Isaiah (reconstructed) suggests that Isa. 11:1-5 refers to the Branch of David (4Q161 frs. 8-10, 18-25). 4Q511 65:1 is a fragment.

Ringgren

צֶמֶר *ṣemer*

Contents: I. Etymology. II. Concrete and Figurative Use. III. The Prohibition against Mixed Weaves in Dt. 22:11 and Lev. 19:19.

I. Etymology. The term *ṣemer* is a primary noun.[1] The root *ḍamr* is attested in several Semitic languages, including Ugar. *ṣml*(?),[2] Eth. *ḍamr,* Egyp. Aram. *'mr, qmr,* Palmyr. *'mr',*[3] Biblical Aram. *'ᵃmar,* Syr. *'amrā,* Mand. *aqamra,*[4] *amra.*[5]

II. Concrete and Figurative Use. Textile weaves are attested archaeologically in Palestine beginning with the Neolithic period. Finds in Naḥal Ḥemar attest weaves from flax. In Egypt the use of linen,[6] the end product of flax finishing, remained determinative, whereas sheep's wool was little used probably because, among other things, it was forbidden to "bring into the temple anything of wool, nor may the people be bur-

ṣemer. O. Bar-Yosef, *A Cave in the Desert: Naḥal Ḥemar* (Jerusalem, 1985); G. Braulik, "Die Abfolge der Gesetze in Deuteronomium 12–26 und der Dekalog," in N. Lohfink, ed., *Das Deuteronomium: Entstehung, Gestalt und Botschaft. BETL* 68 (1985), 252-72; C. M. Carmichael, "Forbidden Mixtures," *VT* 32 (1982) 394-415; I. Goldziher, "Zu *Śa aṭnêz,*" *ZAW* 20 (1900) 36-37; M. Görg, "Eine rätselhafte Textilbezeichnung im AT," *BN* 12 (1980) 13-17; S. Krauss, *Talmudische Archäologie,* I (1910, repr. Leipzig, 1966), esp. 127-207; H. F. Lutz, *Textiles and Costumes among the Peoples of the Ancient Near East* (New York, 1923); Z. Meshel, *Kuntillet 'Ajrûd: A Religious Centre from the Time of the Judaean Monarchy on the Border of Sinai* (Jerusalem, 1978); A. L. Oppenheim, "Essay on Overland Trade in the First Millennium B.C.," *JCS* 21 (1967) 236-54.

1. *BLe,* § 61j'.
2. M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, "Zur ugaritischen Lexikographie I (PRU 5)," *BiOr* 23 (1966) 132; a different view is taken by J. C. Greenfield, "Ugaritic Lexicographical Notes," *JCS* 21 (1967) 90.
3. *DNSI,* II, 873.
4. *MdD,* 33.
5. M. Dietrich, "Zum mandäischen Wortschatz," *BiOr* 24 (1967) 293.
6. → פשׁת *pēšeṯ.*

ied in such."[7] By contrast, Mesopotamian textiles include both wool and linen, though wool was more widespread.[8]

Both clothing and the material from which it was made, namely, wool, might be demanded as tribute. Scarlet or purple wool (Heb. *'argāmān*) was especially valued, and is found among the tribute the Ugaritic king Niqmadu must pay to the Hittite commander.[9] Wool also appears as tribute in the OT: in 2 K. 3:4 as duty the Moabite king Mesha must pay to Israel, though the historical reliability of 2 K. 3:4ff. is uncertain.[10]

The first word in the expression used here, *'êlîm ṣemer,* is a measurement, lit. "the wool of one hundred thousand rams," the entity being measured then functioning as an apposition.[11] One original suggestion is that the reference is to "sheep with much wool" (note the enclitic *mem*).[12]

Ezk. 27:18 mentions wool as merchandise for Tyre. The verse is part of a "list of import merchandise" (vv. 12-24) worked into the *qînâ* for Tyre.[13]

The "edifying observation"[14] in Jgs. 6:36-40 focuses on God's sign. Gideon lays *gizzaṯ haṣṣemer,* "freshly shorn wool," on a threshing floor; if it absorbs water differently than the surrounding material, then he can be sure of God's aid.

The "ode to a capable wife" suggests that she seeks wool and flax (Prov. 31:13). Hos. 2:7,11(Eng. 5,9) confirms that these two materials were viewed as basic necessities.

Because it is a natural product, wool is easily damaged. Isa. 51:8 alludes to such damage by portraying the demise of Israel's adversaries in drastic analogy to worms eating wool. Wool can also be damaged by mold *(beged ṣemer),* which the regulation concerning "leprosy" on clothing in Lev. 13:47-48,52,59 places under the control of the priests. In Lev. 13 *ṣemer* refers to material rather than to the product of shorn wool that, as witnesses from the talmudic period show, was bought and sold in the form of tufts.

The comparison in Ps. 147:16 perhaps alludes to such tufts. The hymnic predication of Yahweh says that "he gives snow like wool (tufts),"[15] a reference to snowfall. The *tertium comparationis* can also be the white color,[16] an interpretation supported by Isa. 1:18 (cf. Dnl. 7:9): "If your sins are like scarlet, shall they (then) be like snow? If they are red like crimson, shall they (then) become like wool?" The parallelism focuses on

---

7. Herodotus *Hist.* 2.81; cf. C. Strauss-Seeber, *LexÄg,* VI, 1286.

8. H. Waetzoldt, *RLA,* VI, 18ff.

9. M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, "*obrussa* reines Gold," *WO* 3 (1964-66) 206ff.

10. S. Timm, *Die Dynastie Omri. FRLANT* 124 (1982), 171ff.

11. E. König, *Historisch-Comparative Syntax der hebräischen Sprache* (Leipzig, 1897), §333d.

12. *HAL,* III, 1035a.

13. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1983), 46-51.

14. W. Richter, *Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Richterbuch. BBB* 18 (1963), 213-14; idem, *Die Bearbeitungen des "Retterbuches" in der deuteronomischen Epoche. BBB* 21 (1964), 113.

15. See W. Stärk, *Lyrik (Psalmen, Hoheslied und Verwandtes). SAT* 3/1 (1920), 47.

16. So *HAL,* III, 1035a.

wool's white color; although sheep are indeed washed before shearing (Cant. 4:2; 6:6), newly shorn wool is anything but white.[17] Here *ṣemer* probably refers to the wool that has already been washed, i.e., to wool after it has been processed further.

The figurative reproach against the Judean upper classes in Ezk. 34:3 alludes to the material. The metonymical reference to the shepherds clothing themselves with the wool of their sheep *(lbš 'eṯ-haṣṣemer)* probably accuses them of infringing on property that does not belong to them.[18] Ezk. 44:17 uses the same device *('lh ṣemer)*. The draft constitution forbids the use of woolen clothing for service in the temple forecourt, justifying the prohibition with reference to wool's inclination to make a person sweat (v. 18).

III. The Prohibition against Mixed Weaves in Dt. 22:11 and Lev. 19:19. The prohibition against weaves mixed of linen and wool in Dt. 22:11[19] is of some historical significance.The comparable regulation in Lev. 19:19 was introduced to complement Dt. 22:9-11, and its formulation suggests an extremely early date of composition[20] even though the redactional classification remains uncertain.

The text of Dt. 22:1-12 provides a bridge between 21:1-23 with the theme of death in the midst of life to 22:13-29 with its prohibited relations between husband and wife. Dt. 22:1-12 combines regulations designed to preserve both animal and human life with prohibitions against certain mixes.[21] As far as the theme of prohibited mixes is concerned, one might keep in mind that wool and linen have different origins (animal, plant), different functions (wool provides warmth [Job 31:20], linen cools [Ezk. 44:17-18]), and are treated differently in daily use (linen can be boiled, wool cannot).

Various literary witnesses attest the use of linen weaves embroidered with wool.[22] The reference is probably to the fine vestments worn by dignitaries, though also perhaps to the clothing on idols.[23] Iconographic evidence attests the presence of material with colorful patterns in the Syrian-Palestinian region.[24]

Both the tent curtains in P's description of the sanctuary in Ex. 26 and parts of the high priestly vestments in Ex. 28 are made from a mix of crimson wool and byssus. M. Haran suggests that it is precisely the sacredness of this particular material that prompts its prohibition in Lev. 19:19; Dt. 22:11.[25] The problem with this interpretation is that these interpretive suggestions from P are not explicit in Deuteronomy.

Genuine mixed weaves in which the warp is made of linen and the weft of wool

---

17. Krauss, 137.
18. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2*, 214-15.
19. See Mish. *Kil.* 9.
20. A. Cholewiński, *Heiligkeitsgesetz und Deuteronomium. AnBibl* 66 (1976), 304-5.
21. Braulik, 265ff.
22. Oppenheim, 246-47.
23. D. B. Weisberg, "Wool and Linen Material in Texts from the Time of Nebuchadnezzar," *ErIsr* 16 (1982) 222-23.
24. *ANEP*, nos. 3, 52, etc.
25. M. Haran, "The Complex of Ritual Acts Performed Inside the Tabernacle," *Studies in the Religion of the Bible. ScrHier* 8 (1961), 281.

were found in Kuntillet 'Ajrud.[26] The existence of such textiles raises the question of what prompted the prohibition. Some interpreters associate it with the thwarting of magical practices.[27]

This interpretation goes back to Ignaz Goldziher (1850-1921) and is based on Maimonides' description of the Sabeans' priestly vestments made from a mixed weave, though some question remains concerning just which religious community is meant.[28] The description does not in any case seem to refer to the ritual vestments of the Mandeans.[29] References to an Arabic magic ritual during which cotton and sheep's wool are mixed similarly remain uncertain. Moreover, Goldziher's examples raise fundamental doubts because of their late date.

Yet another approach takes as its point of departure the Hebrew word for these textiles, *ša'aṭnēz*. With its five consonants, this noun probably represents a foreign word. M. Görg elaborated on Gesenius's suggestion of Egyptian derivation. On this view the word probably derives from Egyp. *s'ḏ3*, "to falsify standards, weights, etc.," and *nḏ*, "weave." The meaning would then accord with *kíbdēlos* in the LXX.

The meaning derived from this Egyptian derivation and the LXX would then be "deceptive weave," and would allude to economic transgressions.[30] The context, however, suggests that such a reference represents at most only a secondary aspect of the prohibition, particularly since the suspicion seems well founded that *ša'aṭnēz* represents a secondary interpretive addendum in both passages (Lev. 19:19; Dt. 22:11).[31]

Attempts to uncover more profound reasoning for the prohibition against mixed weaves ("what God has separated, let no one mix"[32]) remain as yet questionable.

Rüterswörden

26. A. Sheffer, cited in Meshel.

27. So G. von Rad, *Deuteronomy*. *OTL* (Eng. trans. 1966), 141; a more cautious approach is taken by A. D. H. Mayes, *Deuteronomy*. *NCBC* (1979), 308.

28. K. Rudolph, *Die Mandäer I*. *FRLANT* 74 (1960), 36ff.

29. See K. Rudolph, *Die Mandäer II*. *FRLANT* 75 (1961), 48ff.

30. See *s'ḏ3* in the Instruction of Amenemope, 17,18 (*ANET*, 423): "Do not lean on the scales nor falsify the weights, nor damage the fractions of the measure"; also 18,16.

31. G. Seitz, *Redaktionsgeschichtliche Studien zum Deuteronomium*. *BWANT* 93 (1971), 250.

32. *AuS*, V, 105.

v. 52 and v. 53b, they are probably also the subject in v. 53a. Otherwise one might consider whether *ḥayyîm* is the subject (cf. Ps. 31:11[10]; 88:4[3]): "My life is destroyed in the Pit."

6. *Substantive.* The subst. *ṣᵉmi/ītuṯ* occurs in Lev. 25:23,30 in connection with the regulations concerning restitution and the sale of property and houses (vv. 23-34). Those who sell a dwelling house within a walled city can buy it back or "redeem" it up to the end of the year of sale (v. 29). V. 30 then adds that "if it [the house] is not redeemed before a full year has elapsed, a house that is in a walled city shall pass *liṣmîṯuṯ* to the purchaser, throughout the generations." Alongside this doubtless extremely old legal principle,[13] a much later regulation (so Elliger) stipulates that "the land shall not be sold *liṣmiṯuṯ*, for the land is mine [Yahweh's]" (v. 23a); the sold land is rather to be "redeemed" (vv. 24-25). Commensurate with Ugar. *ṣamātu,* Heb. *liṣmi/īṯuṯ* means "once and for all, irrevocably."[14] The house in question belongs irrevocably to the purchaser and his descendants; by contrast, the sale of land can never be final or irrevocable.

III. LXX. The LXX offers various renderings for *ṣmt,* including especially *exolethreúein* (4 times), *ekdiṓkein,* and *thanatoún* (twice each).

Schmoldt

---

13. Loretz, 276; K. Elliger, *Leviticus. HAT* I/4 (1966), 347.
14. See I above; also Loretz, 275-79.

צִנָּה *ṣinnâ* → מגן *māḡēn*

צנע *ṣn'*

Contents: I. Occurrences. II. Etymology. III. Proverbs and Sirach. IV. Mic. 6:8. V. Qumran.

ṣn'. J. H. Hertz, "Micah 6,8," *ExpT* 46 (1934/35) 188; J. P. Hyatt, "On the Meaning and Origin of Micah 6:8," *ATR* 34 (1952) 232-39; H. J. Stoebe, "'Und demütig sein vor deinem Gott': Micha 6,8," *WuD* 6 (1959) 180-94; idem, "צנע *ṣn'* to be careful," *TLOT,* III, 1087-88; D. Winton Thomas, "The Root צנע in Hebrew, and the Meaning of קדרנית in Malachi III,14," *JJS* 1 (1948/49) 182-88.

I. Occurrences. This root occurs but twice in the Hebrew OT, once as the qal pass. ptcp. *ṣānûa'* and once as the hiphil inf. abs. *haṣnēa'*. The term *ṣānûa'* and two hiphil forms also occur in Sirach.

II. Etymology. Translations from the ancient versions vary widely (see below), and the etymology is not particularly helpful. The Arab. *ṣana'a,* "to make," occasionally has the connotation of skillful or artistic production, comparable perhaps to Syr. *ṣᵉnî',* "skillful, clever." Winton Thomas has proposed that a comparison between OSA *ṣn',* "secure, fortify," and Eth. *ṣan'a,* "be hard, firm,"[1] with Middle Heb. and Jewish Aram. *ṣn',* "preserve, conceal," might suggest a basic meaning "to empower, preserve," though the semantic relationship between the two terms remains obscure. The Jewish Aram. *ṣᵉnîa',* "modest," derives from "preserve."

III. Proverbs and Sirach. The meaning must thus be construed from the actual use of the term in Hebrew. Prov. 11:2 is revealing in its assertion that "when pride ['presumption,' *zāḏôn*] comes, then comes disgrace *(qālôn);* but wisdom is with the *ṣᵉnû'îm.*" Although the passage does not fully implement the antithetical parallelism, it is clear that *zāḏôn* and *ṣᵉnû'îm* are antitheses. A *ṣānûa'* is apparently someone who is conscious of human limitations and is thus "modest and in control of oneself" (cf. LXX *tapeinós*), characteristics well suited to the wisdom ideal of the person with self-control. The word's association with "wisdom," however, may also suggest the translation "thoughtful."

Sir. 31(34):22 reads: "In everything you do be *ṣānûa',* and no harm [NRSV 'sickness'] will overtake you." The LXX translates as *entrechḗs.* According to Jer. *Yoma* 43c, *ṣnw'* is the opposite of *gargᵉrān,* "glutton." The context reveals only a concern with avoiding harm, so that the word might mean "careful," "attentive," "prudent, circumspect," any of which would fit the wisdom context quite well.

The context in Sir. 42:8 is not entirely clear. "Do not be ashamed to correct the stupid or foolish, . . . then you will be *zāhîr* in truth and an *'îš ṣānûa'* to all," i.e., everyone will recognize you as such. The parallelism with *zāhîr,* "careful, cautious," points in the direction of "thoughtful, modest." The LXX renders *zāhîr* as *pepaideuménos* and *ṣānûa'* as *dedokimasménos.* The hiphil is used in 16:25: "I will let my spirit sparkle (*nb'* hiphil) in a well-measured fashion *(bᵉmišqāl),* and declare (*ḥwh* piel) my knowledge *bᵉhaṣnēa'*. The context suggests a meaning such as "well-measured" or perhaps "considered," "prudently." The LXX reads *en akribeía,* "with care/precision."

Sir. 32(35):3 reads: "Speak, you who are older, for it is your right, but *hṣn'* with your knowledge, and do not interrupt the music." Here one might translate "be economical, reserved," i.e., refrain from exaggerated instruction that dampens the joyous mood.

IV. Mic. 6:8. Mic. 6:8 summarizes the demands Yahweh makes on his people: "Do justice *(mišpāṭ),* love *ḥeseḏ,* and *haṣnēa' leḵeṯ* with *('im)* God." The context shows only that the concern is with ethical behavior in general. Taking a cue from Prov. 11:2, one

1. Beeston, 143; *LexLingAeth,* 1288.

It is not necessary to introduce a second root *ṣ'd* with unknown meaning as an etymon for *ṣᵉ'āḏôṯ*, "anklets" (Isa. 3:20),[8] and for *'eṣ'āḏâ*, "armlet" (Nu. 31:50; 2 S. 1:10, *'ᵃšer 'al-zᵉrō'ô*).[9] The notion of "anklet" proceeds semantically to "armlet."[10] Hence L. Kopf's suggestion is also unnecessary[11] that one associate *'eṣ'āḏâ* and *ṣᵉ'āḏâ* with Arab. *'aḍud*, "(upper) arm," or with *'iḍād*,[12] "bracelet."[13] Because according to 2 S. 1:10 the royal insignia included both a crown and an armlet, some scholars suggest reading *hā'eṣ'āḏâ* instead of *hā'ēḏûṯ* alongside *hannēzer* in 2 K. 11:12.[14]

2. *Occurrences*. The verb *ṣ'd*, "solemnly stride, step," occurs 7 times in the qal and once in the hiphil (Job 18:14). Additional occurrences include Sir. 9:13 and the cj. *ṣō'ēḏ* instead of *ṣō'eh* in Isa. 63:1 suggested by Symmachus, Syr., and Vulg. The noun *ṣa'aḏ*, "step," occurs 14 times, while *ṣᵉ'āḏâ*, "march, advance," occurs twice (2 S. 5:24 par. 1 Ch. 14:15). In Isa. 3:20 *ṣᵉ'āḏôṯ* means "anklets," and in Nu. 31:50 and 2 S. 1:10 *'eṣ'āḏâ* refers to a clasp or bracelet. The term *miṣ'āḏ* in Ps. 37:23; Prov. 20:24; Dnl. 11:43 means "step, entourage." The root occurs with notable frequency in Proverbs (the verb once in the qal [7:8] and *ṣa'aḏ* 4 times [4:12; 5:5; 16:9; 30:29, also *miṣ'āḏ* in 20:24) and Job (the verb once in the hiphil [18:14] and *ṣa'aḏ* 5 times [14:16; 18:7; 31:4,37; 34:21]). Forms of the root *ṣ'd*, somewhat like the Eng. verb "stride," are more frequently used in elevated, poetic expressions.

II. OT.

1. *People*. When the enemy is watching one's footsteps, one cannot walk in the streets (Lam. 4:18). The steps of those who are versed in the ways of wisdom will not be hampered (Prov. 4:12), while the strong steps of the wicked are shortened (Job 18:7). Bildad's second response to Job (18:14) insists that the wicked must stride to the king of terrors, the *rex tremendus*[15] or personification of death. The path of the loose woman similarly leads inexorably to death, "her steps follow the path to Sheol" (Prov. 5:5). According to Job 14:16 (cf. 31:4), God counts Job's steps, i.e., keeps a watchful eye on Job's behavior to discover any transgression. A person's steps thus become a metaphor for one's behavior (cf. Job 31:37; Prov. 5:5; 16:9; Jer. 10:23; the LXX also speaks of such deportment when it renders *ṣᵉ'āḏay* in Job 14:16 as *epitēdeúmata*).

---

8. See *AuS*, V, 350-51; Dalman identifies *ṣᵉ'āḏôṯ* as the pl. of the sg. *'eṣ'āḏâ*.

9. So *BDB*, 857.

10. König, 391.

11. L. Kopf, "Arabische Etymologien und Parallelen zum Bibelwörterbuch," *VT* 8 (1958) 198.

12. Not *'iṣād* as in *HAL*, III, 1040b.

13. Concerning bracelets and anklets as adornment, see G. Fohrer, *BHHW*, III, 1706ff.; H. Weippert, *BRL*², 284-85; E. E. Platt, "Jewelry of Bible Times and the Catalog of Isa 3:18-23," *AUSS* 17 (1979) 17-84, 189-201.

14. E.g., H. Tiktin, *Kritische Untersuchungen zu den Büchern Samuelis. FRLANT* 16 (33) (1900/1983); H. Gressmann, *Die älteste Geschichtsschreibung und Prophetie Israels. SAT* II/1 (²1921).

15. See Vergil *Georgica* 4.469.

When Prov. 20:24 asserts that "all our steps are ordered by Yahweh [lit. 'a man's steps come from Yahweh']; how then can we understand our own ways?" it articulates a deterministic view that "shakes wisdom at its very foundations," focusing not on some "insincere act that Yahweh might discover, but on the fixing of a person's fate quite independent of any intentional human action."[16] The same notion recurs in Prov. 16:9: "The human mind plans the way, but Yahweh directs the steps." Jer. 10:23 similarly finds that our paths are not really subject to our own volition, i.e., we are not really able to determine our own steps; rather, it is God who "makes me stride freely" (2 S. 22:37 par. Ps. 18:37[Eng. 36]). Sir. 37:15 thus advises one to pray to God "that he may direct your steps in truth." The Qumranites were also aware that no human beings can determine their own way and guide their own steps (1QS 11:10; 1QH 15:13).

The MT of Ps. 37:23 reads: "A man's steps are made firm by Yahweh when he delights in his way." Because the first three words coincide with Prov. 20:24, however, Ps. 37:23 can also be translated "a man's steps come from Yahweh," a proverbial aphorism pointing out how Yahweh guides the steps of the righteous. In the second part one should probably follow B. Duhm in reading *kônᵃnô bᵉḏarkô yeḥpāṣ*, "he holds him upright when he delights in his way."[17] Here too we find the notion that Yahweh ultimately determines a person's path.

2. *God.* In the theophany portrayal in Jgs. 5:4, Yahweh's coming and solemn advance stir up the earth, the heavens, and the mountains. Ps. 68:8-9(7-8) reads similarly: "O God, when you went out before your people, when you marched through the wilderness, the earth quaked." Hab. 3:12 tells how during Yahweh's battle with the nations he "trod the earth in fury" and "trampled nations in anger."[18] Isa. 63:1 (cj.) also views Yahweh as a warrior who proudly strides in from Edom. According to 2 S. 5:24 par. 1 Ch. 14:15, David is not to advance in battle against the Philistines until he hears "the sound of marching in the tops of the balsam trees" indicating that Yahweh has gone out before him to wage the earthly battle in heaven as well. 1QM 12:9 similarly asserts that the host of spirits keeps pace with the steps of the warriors on earth, i.e., fights with them.

III. 1. *LXX.* The LXX translates the verb *ṣā'aḏ* with forms of *apaírein, aírein, epibaínein,* and *diabaínein.* Twice (Gen. 49:22; Hab. 3:12) it misreads *ṣ'd* as *ṣ'r.* It offers no equivalent for Prov. 7:8, and interprets the hiphil in Job 18:14 freely. It translates the subst. *ṣa'aḏ* 4 times with *diábēma,* once each with *poreía, epitḗdeuma,* and *íchnē,* and once verbally with *poreúetai* (Prov. 30:29). It translates freely in 4 passages without giving a direct equivalent. Twice (Job 18:7; Lam. 4:18) it misreads *ṣ'd* as *ṣ'r* or *ṣ'yr.* The LXX renders *'eṣ'āḏâ* as *chlidṓn,* "bracelet" or "necklace," similarly also *ṣᵉ'āḏôṯ* (Isa. 3:20). It translates *miṣ'āḏ* twice as *diábēma* (Ps. 37:23 = Prov. 20:24), and

16. H. Gese, *Lehre und Wirklichkeit in der alten Weisheit* (Tübingen, 1958), 46-47.

17. B. Duhm, *Die Psalmen. KHC* XIV (²1922), 108.

18. Concerning *ṣā'aḏ* as a technical term in theophany portrayals, see J. Jeremias, *Theophanie. WMANT* 10 (²1977), 8, 184.

renders Dnl. 11:43 freely. Its rendering of *ṣᵉʿāḏâ* in 2 S. 5:24 as *synkleismós* might have been prompted by an original *māṣôr,* while the translation as *sysseismós* in 1 Ch. 14:15 probably attests the presence of *ṣᵉʿārâ* rather than *ṣᵉʿāḏâ.*

Jerome translates the verb *ṣāʿaḏ* with forms of *discurrere, transire* (twice), *pertransire, transcendere, incedere, conculcare,* and *calcare.* The Vulg. translates *ṣaʿaḏ* in 10 passages as *gressus* and once each as *passus, gradus, vestigium,* and a form of *gradi* (Prov. 30:29), so also 2 S. 5:24 par. 1 Ch. 14:15 for *ṣᵉʿāḏâ.* In Nu. 31:50 and Isa. 3:20, the Vulg. uses *periscelis,* "knee/thigh clasp or bangle," while the context in 2 S. 1:10 *(de brachio illius)* prompted it to choose *armilla.* It renders *miṣʿāḏ* as *gressus* and once as *transire.*

2. *Qumran.* The verb *ṣʿd* occurs twice in Qumran (1QS 1:13; 3:11) as the inf. const. *lṣʿwd* with the specialized meaning "transgress," a meaning not attested for *ṣʿd* in the OT. The substantive occurs 6 times (1QS 11:10; 1QM 12:9;[19] 1QH 15:13,21; 1QH fr. 2:6; CD 20:18). The meaning "step" corresponds to OT usage and similarly focuses on the realization that people cannot guide their own steps (cf. 1QS 11:10; 1QH 15:13).[20]

Kellermann†

19. See II.2 above.
20. See II.1 above.

צָעִיר *ṣāʿîr;* צָעַר *ṣāʿar;* מִצְעָר *miṣʿār;* צְעִירָה *ṣᵉʿîrâ*

Contents: I. Root and Distribution. II. 1. OT Forms and Occurrences; 2. Parallel Terms. III. General Use: 1. The Verb *ṣāʿar;* 2. The Noun *ṣāʿîr;* 3. Other Substantive Forms. IV. Theological Considerations. V. Qumran and LXX.

I. Root and Distribution. The root *ṣʿr* (cf. also *zʿr*)[1] seems to be attested throughout the Semitic languages; cf., e.g., Akk. *ṣeḫēru, ṣaḫāru,* "be/become small, young," *ṣeḫru* I,

ṣāʿîr. O. Bächli, "Die Erwählung des Geringen im AT," *TZ* 22 (1966) 385-95; *NSS,* §§165, 174d, 192d; S. E. Loewenstamm, *Comparative Studies in Biblical and Ancient Oriental Literatures. AOAT* 204 (1980), esp. 249-55; O. Loretz, "Ugaritische und hebräische Lexikographie (IV)," *UF* 15 (1983) 59-61; M. Sæbø, *Sacharja 9–14. WMANT* 34 (1969), esp. 105-7, 276-82; Wagner, 49.

1. See II.1 below.

[unless one emends the noun here to a piel form]; Job 8:7; 2 Ch. 24:24), the text in Ps. 42:7b(Eng. 6b) is uncertain in that the word has been understood in the expression *har miṣʿār* both in the characteristic sense of "the small mountain"[15] and as the name of an otherwise unknown mountain (NRSV "Mount Mizar").[16] With regard to the abstraction *ṣᵉʿîrâ,*[17] which is generally thought to occur twice (Gen. 43:33; Dnl. 8:9), the form *miṣṣᵉʿîrâ* in Dnl. 8:9 is also construed as a secondary feminine form of the adj. *ṣāʿîr*[18] or emended directly to *ṣᵉʿîrâ.*[19] I will not address the possible fluid transitions to place-names (cf. Ps. 42:7b[6b]; perhaps also Jer. 48:4; see *BHS;* though cf. Gen. 19:20-22, with its interpretation of the name, and 2 K. 8:21).

As far as the overall distribution of this root is concerned, one does notice that it occurs in many and widely varying literary contexts without any discernible concentration in a particular context.

2. *Parallel Terms.* The words of this group, especially the noun *ṣāʿîr,* are often accompanied by parallel and antithetical terms that are of semasiological significance regarding both the use and meaning of the overall group.

Parallel and synonymous terms involve first of all the verb → מעט *māʿaṭ,* "be/become little, few" (Jer. 30:19), then as regards *ṣāʿîr* also → דל *dal,* "low, paltry, insignificant" (Jgs. 6:15), *qāṭān* (1 S. 9:21) along with *qāṭôn* (Isa. 60:22), "small,"[20] on the one hand, and *nibzeh,* "despised" (Ps. 119:141), on the other.[21] With the possible exception of the last mentioned, these words constitute a relatively well-defined word field. By contrast, the antonyms are not as uniform. The terms → כבד *kāḇēḏ,* "be heavy, weighty, honored" (Job 14:21), and the hiphil *hiḵbîḏ,* "honor" (Jer. 30:19, par. *hirbâ,* "multiply"), constitute the antonyms for the verb. The most frequent antonyms for *ṣāʿîr* are → בכור *bᵉḵôr (bᵉkhôr),* "the firstborn" (Gen. 43:33; 48:14; Josh. 6:26; 1 K. 16:34), and *bᵉḵîrâ,* "the older one" (Gen. 19:31; 29:26), then also *raḇ,* "large" (Gen. 25:23),[22] *'addîrîm,* "nobles" (Jer. 14:3),[23] and *yāšîš,* "old" (Job 32:6). The opposite of *ṣᵉʿîrâ* is *bᵉḵōrâ,* "position of the firstborn" (Gen. 43:33).[24] In Dnl. 8:9 the verb *gāḏal,* "be/become great, grow," is the antonym. Finally, the opposite of *miṣʿār* is the verb *śāgâ,* "grow" (Job 8:7).

III. General Use. The findings in II.2 show that the general use of this word group quite often involves polar juxtapositions. Antonyms are used to express various circumstances.

---

15. See *GesB,* 453b; *BDB,* 859a.
16. See *HAL,* II, 624a; H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59* (Eng. trans. 1987), 440.
17. *GesB,* 689b; cf. Michel, 70.
18. *NSS,* §165.
19. See A. Bentzen, *Daniel. HAT* I/19 (²1952), 56; O. Plöger, *Das Buch Daniel. KAT* XVIII (1965), 122; *HAL,* III, 1041b.
20. → קטן *qṭn.*
21. → בזה *bāzâ (bāzāh),* II, 60-65.
22. → רבב *rbb.*
23. See *HAL,* I, 13-14.
24. See *HAL,* I, 131a.

1. *The Verb ṣāʿar.* In its few occurrences the verb expresses the opposite of an honorable position. In divine discourse the notion of being "of mean state" is negated in contrast to the promise of an honorable restoration of the people (Jer. 30:19). In a wisdom context the term contrasts how people may be "brought low" despite their honorable appearances (Job 14:21). The substantive use of the participle in Zech. 13:7 resembles the use of *ṣāʿîr* in reference to the least among the sheep of the flock (cf. Jer. 49:20; 50:45).

2. *The Noun ṣāʿîr.* The adj. *ṣāʿîr,* "small, young, low," is used more in the substantival than in the attributive sense, something also suggested by the *qāṭîl* form.[25] It is used largely as an independent substantive, and in several instances as a predicate adjective (e.g., Jgs. 6:15; 1 S. 9:21; Ps. 119:141), though also as a subject (5 times) and object (twice).

As the frequent contrast to *beḵōr/beḵîrâ,* "the firstborn, older," *ṣāʿîr* refers to someone whose status is lesser not only as regards chronological age, but in other ways as well within the framework of a fixed familial order. The classic expression of this notion occurs in Gen. 29:26 and 43:33 (cf. also 19:31ff.; 48:14; Jgs. 6:15). This sociological aspect applies to the wider social order as well to the extent that the word is also associated with a clan or tribe (cf. 1 S. 9:21; Ps. 68:28[27]; Mic. 5:1[2]), with the "nobles" among the people (Jer. 14:3), or with the people as a whole (cf. Gen. 25:23; Isa. 60:22; also Jer. 48:4). In a more general sense, the word can apply to age and time (*yāmîm,* "days/time," Job 30:1; 32:6).[26] As a contrasting term, it can also express part of a whole, possibly in the fashion of a merism (Josh. 6:26; 1 K. 16:34).[27] Even when the word stands alone, the aspect of totality may still be discernible, expressing, e.g., the broad scope or great significance of some (chastising) act, in the sense of "including even . . . ," as is likely the case in Jer. 48:4; 49:20; 50:45; cf. Zech. 13:7. Finally, as an expression of devout cultic language the word can also function as a humble self-designation (Ps. 119:141).

3. *Other Substantive Forms.* The noun *miṣʿār* can refer in various ways to something viewed as "small" or "insignificant," e.g., a small city (Gen. 19:20), the numerical insignificance of an army (2 Ch. 24:24), a short period of time (Isa. 63:18), or the initially miserable fate of someone who later becomes "great" (Job 8:7).[28] The possible use of *ṣeʿîrâ* in Dnl. 8:9 as well as Gen. 43:33 (see above) as an abstract noun also expresses the transition from something "small" to something "very great."

IV. Theological Considerations. Although the varying use of the word group associated with *ṣʿr* makes a rather disparate impression, its theological implications are re-

25. See *BLe,* § 61nα.

26. → יום *yôm,* VI, 7-32.

27. Cf. in this regard, A. M. Honeyman, "'Merismus' in Biblical Hebrew," *JBL* 71 (1952) 11-18; H. A. Brongers, "Merismus, Synekdoche und Hendiadys in der Bibel-Hebräischen Sprache," *OTS* 14 (1965) 100-114.

28. See G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 183ff.

צָפָה ṣāpâ; מִצְפֶּה miṣpeh; צְפִיָּה ṣippîyâ

Contents: I. Etymology. II. Occurrences and Use. III. Meaning: 1. General Considerations; 2. Secular and Military Contexts; 3. Prophetic Office; 4. Other Considerations; 5. Nominal Derivatives. IV. LXX and Qumran. V. *ṣph* II.

I. Etymology. Two homonymous roots are to be distinguished here: *ṣph* I, "look out," and *ṣph* II, "cover, overlay."

The Heb. root *ṣph* I is related to Bab. *ṣubbû(m)*/Assyr. *ṣabbû(m)* D, "to look at something from a distance, observe, examine."[1] The Ugar. term *ṣp* is disputed, with suggestions including "gaze" and "brightness, sparkle."[2] One Neo-Punic inscription includes the form *ṣp'*, which might mean "seer."[3] In Middle Hebrew *ṣāpâ* means "look out, look, predict," piel "hope for, expect"; and Jewish Aramaic attests *ṣp'* ithpeal, "look out."[4]

Nominal derivatives include *miṣpeh*, "observation post," also as the place-name, and *ṣippîyâ*, "observation point"; other place-names include *miṣpâ*, *ṣᵉpaṯ*, *ṣᵉpaṯâ*,[5] perhaps → צפון *ṣāpôn*. Personal and tribal names whose derivation from *ṣph* is questionable include *ṣipyôn*, *ṣᵉpô/î*, and *ṣᵉpāṯâ*.[6]

The noun **ṣāpâ* (Ezk. 32:6) derives from *ṣûp* or is to be emended to *ṣōʼâ*.[7]

ṣāpâ. H. Bardtke, "Der Erweckungsgedanke in der exilisch-nachexilischen Literatur des ATs," *Von Ugarit nach Qumran. FS O. Eissfeldt. BZAW* 77 (1958), 9-24; W. Beyerlin, *Die Rettung der Bedrängten in den Feindpsalmen der Einzelnen auf institutionelle Zusammenhänge untersucht. FRLANT* 99 (1970); W. H. Brownlee, "Ezekiel's Parable of the Watchman and the Editing of Ezekiel," *VT* 28 (1978) 392-408; L. Delekat, *Asylie und Schutzorakel am Zionheiligtum* (Leiden, 1967); R. Dobbie, "The Text of Hosea IX 8," *VT* 5 (1955) 199-203; G. R. Driver, "Problems in the Hebrew Text of Job," *Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East. FS H. H. Rowley. SVT* 3 (1955), 72-93; I. Eitan, "A Contribution to Isaiah Exegesis," *HUCA* 12/13 (1937/38) 55-88; E. Jenni, *HP;* J. Jeremias, *Kultprophetie und Gerichtsverkündigung in der späten Königszeit Israels. WMANT* 35 (1970); O. Keel, *Deine Blicke sind Tauben: Zur Metaphorik des Hohen Liedes. SBS* 114/115 (1984); J. Reider, "Etymological Studies in Biblical Hebrew," *VT* 2 (1952) 113-30; H. Graf Reventlow, *Wächter über Israel: Ezechiel und seine Tradition. BZAW* 82 (1962); A. E. Rüthy, "Wächter und Späher im AT," *TZ* 21 (1965) 300-309; S. Schechter and C. Taylor, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira* (Cambridge, 1899); R. Smend, *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach hebräisch und deutsch* (Berlin, 1906); H. Utzschneider, *Hosea, Prophet vor dem Ende. OBO* 31 (1980); P. Welten, *Geschichte und Geschichtsdarstellung in den Chronikbüchern. WMANT* 42 (1973); G. Wilhelmi, "Polster in Babel? Eine Überlegung zu Jesaja XXI 5 + 8," *VT* 25 (1975) 121-23.

1. *AHw*, III, 1107-8.
2. *KTU* 1.14, III, 45; *ANET*, 144, l. 149, "let me bask in the brightness of her eyes"; *WUS*, no. 2342; cf. *HAL*, III, 1044a: "in the gaze/sparkle of her eyes."
3. *KAI* 159.6.
4. *ANH*, 166.
5. See *HAL*, III, 1051.
6. On *ṣāpîṯ* see II below (Isa. 21:5; *BLe*, 501c).
7. For the former see König, 392; for the latter, *HAL*, III, 992a, 1045b.

II. Occurrences and Use. The verb *ṣph* I occurs 27 times in the qal in the canonical books, as well as 3 times in Sirach. The active participle refers in 20 instances (and twice in Sirach) to a profession. The verb occurs 9 times in the piel (and once in Sirach), and is attested twice participially in reference to a profession. "The term צפה, *'look out,'* refers in the qal to a subject's activity with no emphasis on any specific object. . . . That which is to be observed . . . is apparently self-evident and thus unnamed or, like the professional designation 'sentinel' itself, is of a completely general nature and thus remains wholly indefinite. As soon as something definite is to be observed, however, the piel is used."[8] The term can be used absolutely (e.g., 1 S. 4:13; Jer. 48:19), with a direct object (Prov. 15:3; 31:27; Nah. 2:2[Eng. 1]; Sir. 51:7), or with a prepositional object (*bᵉ, lᵉ, 'el:* Ps. 37:32; 66:7; Lam. 4:17; Mic. 7:7).

In Ps. 10:8 the form *yiṣpōnû,* "they stealthily watch, lurk" *(< ṣpn),* can be maintained; no emendation to *yiṣpāyû (< ṣph)* (so LXX) is necessary. Similarly, the emendation of *yᵉṣawweh,* "he commands," to *'ᵃṣappeh,* "I will keep lookout," in Ps. 42:9(8) is not necessary.[9] Hos. 9:8 presents enormous text-critical problems.[10] Rudolph reads *ṣōpeh peh 'eprayim 'am 'ᵉlōhay 'el/'al hannāḇî',* "Ephraim opens its maw, the people of my God against the prophet"; Wolff follows the LXX and translates "the watchman of Ephraim is with God"; the term "prophet" is taken as an explanatory gloss; and Jeremias reads, "Even if Ephraim lurks, the prophet (remains) with his God."[11]

The interpretation of *ṣāpōh haṣṣāpîṯ* in Isa. 21:5 (hapax legomenon; not in LXX) also presents difficulties. Earlier exegetes derived both terms from *ṣph* I and translated "set up sentinels on the observation point" (Luther) or something similar. More recent suggestions include (a) translating *ṣāpîṯ* after Aram. *ṣypt',* as "cover, mat," and *ṣāpōh* after *ṣph* II, "someone spreads out the cushions";[12] (b) translating *ṣph* after Arab. *ṣaffa* as "arrange," and *ṣāpîṯ* after Arab. *ḍaif* as "guest";[13] (c) understanding *ṣāpîṯ* after Arab. *ṣafwah,* "the very best, most splendid" ("prepare the table, place an abundance of goods, eat and drink"[14]). Dalman derives both terms from *ṣph* II and suggests that "spread (out) the covering" refers to setting out the meal dishes.[15] The use of *ṣph* I in 21:6,8 militates against a derivation from *ṣph* II. The passage presumably represents a gloss to vv. 6,8 that has ended up in a rather unfortunate location and is probably to be translated following Luther. Wilhelmi suggests combining it with the corrupted text in v. 8a as *wayyiṣep haṣṣōpeh/wayyiqrā' hārō'eh,* "the sentinel watched, the seer called."[16]

---

8. *HP,* 221-22.
9. See *HAL,* III, 1011a-b, 1045a.
10. Dobbie summarizes earlier emendation suggestions.
11. W. Rudolph, *Hosea. KAT* XIII/1 (1966), 171, 173; H. W. Wolff, *Hosea. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1974), 151, 157-58; J. Jeremias, *Der Prophet Hosea. ATD* 24/1 (1983), 113.
12. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27* (Eng. trans. 1997), 300, 304.
13. Eitan, 67.
14. Reider, 116.
15. *AuS,* VI, 143; VII, 218-19.
16. Wilhelmi, 123. See in general *HAL,* III, 1045, 1048-49.

III. Meaning.

1. *General Considerations.* In the qal *ṣph* means "watch out over, pay attention to" (lest something detrimental happen), and is said of God in Ps. 66:7 (cf. Ps. 11:4; 14:2, etc.); Prov. 15:3; Sir. 11:12, and of the "capable wife" in Prov. 31:27. In Gen. 31:49 the contractual partners Laban and Jacob reaffirm their agreement with the formula "May Yahweh watch between you and me [i.e., check for violations], when we are absent one from the other" (note the wordplay with the place-name *miṣpâ;* see below).

A perjorative modification of this meaning occurs in Ps. 37:32, which asserts that "the wicked watch for the righteous, and seek to kill them," similarly also in Sir. 51:3 (instead of *sela',* "rock," read *ṣela',* "fall," with a double-duty suffix for the first-person sg. from v. 3b[17]). According to the emendation suggested by Jeremias (see above), Hos. 9:8 would be classified here as well.

In the piel *ṣph* refers to the activity of "keeping watch" or "lookout" in tense anticipation of a particular event, e.g., the arrival of aid in times of distress (1 S. 4:13; Jer. 48:19; Nah. 2:2[1]; Lam. 4:17; Sir. 51:7). In Mic. 7:7 anticipation is directed to Yahweh's aid (the par. verb *yḥl,* "wait for," occurs frequently in the psalms of laments, e.g., Ps. 38:16[15]; 42:6,12[5,11]; 43:5).[18] In Ps. 5:4(3) the petitioner offers a sacrifice and asks for Yahweh's helping presence in a cultic-sacral legal case.[19] In both Mic. 7:7 and Ps. 5:4(3), the term *ṣph* can also be translated by the theological notion "to hope."

2. *Secular and Military Contexts.* The active participle of *ṣph* refers frequently to the professional activity of the "sentinel," whose function can be gleaned from several pre-Dtr texts in 1/2 Samuel and 2 Kings. The sentinel goes to an elevated location (the roof of a city gate, or a wall or a tower) to (a) observe the surrounding area and (b) report important occurrences, e.g., the approach of enemies or messengers (2 S. 18:24-27; 2 K. 9:17-20).[20] These two primary tasks are described with stereotypical terminology. The activity of looking or watching is rendered as *(nś' 'ênāw +) r'h,* "(raise one's eyes and) see" (1 S. 14:16; 2 S. 13:34; 18:24,26; 2 K. 9:17), and the transmission of the message with *'mr/qr'/ngd* hiphil, "speak, call out, report" (2 S. 13:34 LXX; 18:25,27; 2 K. 9:18,20).

This stereotypical language also reveals the institutional character of the sentinel. One additional task of the sentinel was to sound the alarm in times of danger, generally by blowing the *šôpār;* although this task plays no role in the aforementioned texts, it can nonetheless be deduced from passages associated with the prophetic office of sentinel.[21]

---

17. See Schechter and Taylor, XLIX; *HAL,* III, 1030 s.v. *ṣela';* 1044b.

18. See H. W. Wolff, *Micah* (Eng. trans. 1990), 209; W. Rudolph, *Micha — Nahum — Habakuk — Zephanja. KAT* XIII/3 (1975), 126.

19. See H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59* (Eng. trans. 1987), 153-56; Beyerlin, 92-94; Delekat, 58 n. 1, suggests translating *ṣph* used absolutely as "serve up" following an interpretation of Isa. 21:5 (see II above) (cf. Beyerlin, 93); this understanding, however, is extremely uncertain.

20. See Bardtke, 19-20.

21. See III.3 below.

In Isa. 52:8 Jerusalem's sentinels joyously discern Yahweh's return to Zion (*r'h b*^{e}, "see with joy/pain"[22]). Isa. 56:10 adduces the image of the sentinel to criticize the behavior of the people's leaders or of the prophets;[23] these sentinels see nothing, are unable to sound any alarm, and are busy only with themselves. The *ṣôpîm* in Sir. 37:14 also refer to the sentinels; the context in which additional terms from the pertinent word field occur (*miṣpeh*, "observation post"; *ngd* hiphil, "report") makes the translation "stargazer" unlikely.[24]

The sentinel is engaged in a specific activity distinct from the more broadly conceived tasks of the "watchman, guard" (*šōmēr;* cf. also the juxtaposition of sentinel and gate watchman [*šō'ēr*] in 2 S. 18:26).

3. *Prophetic Office.* Secular sentinels provide the model for the understanding of prophetic tasks. Two modifications of the sentinel topos can be distinguished.

a. The prophets, like sentinels, are charged with warning the people of danger.[25] Hosea was the first to understand the prophetic office as that of a sentinel, calling himself the "sentinel of Ephraim," and the first to engage in such activity in his own calls to alarm (Hos. 9:8; cf. 8:1).[26] The sounding of the → שׁוֹפָר *šôpār* signals the presence of (deadly) danger (cf. Jer. 4:5,19,21; Am. 3:6, etc.) and as a metaphor for the prophet's warning function is also a fixed part of the sentinel topos in Hosea, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel.

The Dtr prophetic theology also picks up the image of the sentinel. Jer. 6:17 describes the prophets in general as sentinels appointed by Yahweh whose warnings nonetheless go unheeded (cf. Jer. 7:25-26[27]). Ezk. 3:16-21 and 33:2-9 develop the sentinel motif more fully. Ezk. 33:2-6 first describes the role of the sentinel in the secular context. In times of war the authorities[28] appoint (*ntn*) him. As soon as he sees (*r'h*) the enemy advancing, he is to sound the horn (*tq' b*^{e}*šôpār*) and warn (*zhr* hiphil) the people. "The watchman's responsibility is to give the alarm. If he fails here, then he is to be held responsible for the life of the person who has been taken away."[29] Vv. 7-9 then significantly modify the metaphor in applying it to Ezekiel's own commission. In a divine "oracle of appointment,"[30] the prophet is appointed sentinel to warn his people whenever he receives Yahweh's word. Vv. 8-9 then reinterpret what is thus far a description of the sentinel quite in keeping with the previous discussion (see above). The prophet will pay with his own life if he fails to warn individual transgressors of the divine death sentence and in so doing move them to repent. Ezk. 33:16-21,

---

22. See D. Vetter, "ראה *r'h* to see," *TLOT,* III, 1179; Rüthy, 304.
23. See Rüthy, 307.
24. See Smend, 33, 64; *HAL,* III, 1044b.
25. See Bardtke, 19-21.
26. Wolff, *Hosea,* 157.
27. See R. P. Carroll, *Jeremiah. OTL* (1986), 200.
28. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1983), 184.
29. Ibid., 185.
30. Ibid.

which is secondary over against 33:1-9, picks up on 18:24 and develops this notion further.[31]

b. Hab. 2:1 uses the sentinel topos to describe the prophetic reception of revelation. The prophet goes to an elevated location (*mišmereṯ, maṣṣôr* [*BHS*], "watchpost, lookout post") to receive the divine revelation *(dbr)* in a visionary experience (*ṣph* piel + *r'h;* cf. *ḥāzôn,* "vision," in v. 2). The obscure visionary account in Isa. 21:1-10 seems to allude to this tradition (esp. vv. 6-8 with *r'h;* as a place-name *miṣpeh,* "observation post"). Although no clues concerning specific practices are provided that might help interpret the vision, it seems to have been preceded by a period of long, tense anticipation (v. 8). A reference to the practice of "visionary activists"[32] who ascended to the top of elevated places, e.g., mountaintops, can be found in Nu. 23:14 in the "field of sentinels" *(śᵉḏēh ṣōpîm)* on the top of Pisgah (cf. Nu. 24:1-2).

Whereas most exegetes understand such descriptions of a "reception of revelation on the lookout post" in a psychological or metaphorical sense,[33] Jeremias finds in them evidence of prophets who used certain techniques when receiving revelations and were closely associated with the temple. The place to which the prophet went at such times "is described by an Assyrian loanword (*maṣṣartu,* 'guard, sentry, garrison') that was originally a technical term referring to the place where Assyrian birdwatchers and astrologers practiced their craft within the holy precinct; the accompanying verb *(naṣāru)* already refers in a Mari letter to the prophetic reception of revelation. On this view, at least certain prophets also engaged in regular service at the temple in Israel as well."[34] "The verb used in Hab. 2:1 and Isa. 21:5(6-8), צפה 'keep a lookout,' might suggest that such prophets received responses from Yahweh in connection with certain signs, in this context probably signs associated with sacrifices."[35] Jeremias suggests as well that *ṣph* piel in Ps. 5:4(3) and Mic. 7:7 is also to be understood "as an allusion not to military lookouts, but to the service of the cultic prophets on temple 'watch.'"[36]

Mic. 7:4 associates the formula "day of Yahweh" with the sentinel topos. The "day of your sentinels" is the day of "punishment" predicted by the prophets.

4. *Other Considerations.* In Job 15:22 *ṣāpû* (qal pass. ptcp.) means "marked, destined for."[37] An emendation to *ṣāpûn,* "kept in store for, treasured up for," is not necessary.[38]

---

31. See W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), 143-44, 145-46. A different view is taken by W. Eichrodt, *Ezekiel. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1970), 456; cf. in general Reventlow, 116-34; Rüthy, 307-8.

32. K. Elliger, *Das Buch der zwölf Kleinen Propheten,* vol. II, *Die Propheten Nahum, Habakuk, Zephanja, Haggai, Sacharia, Maleachi. ATD* XXV (⁸1982), 39.

33. Concerning earlier views see Rüthy, 305-6.

34. Jeremias, *Kultprophetie,* 185; cf. 104-6.

35. Ibid., 185; concerning opposing views, see W. Rudolph, *Micha — Nahum — Habakuk — Zephanja. KAT* XIII/3 (1975), 194, 214-15.

36. Jeremias, *Kultprophetie,* 107; cf. S. Küchler, *Das priesterliche Orakel in Israel und Juda. BZAW* 33 (1918), 295-96.

37. On this form see *GK,* §75v. On the meaning see Driver, 78.

38. See *HAL,* III, 1044b.

Cant. 7:5(4) evokes the distant inaccessibility and proud sublimity of the beloved by personifying *ṣph* in the comparison: "Your nose is like a tower of Lebanon, overlooking Damascus."[39]

5. *Nominal Derivatives.* The nominal derivatives *ṣippîyâ* (Lam. 4:17) and *miṣpeh* I (2 Ch. 20:24; Isa. 21:8; Sir. 37:14) refer to the "observation post" or "vantage point."

Both *miṣpeh* II and *miṣpâ* are common place-names.[40] The place-name *ṣᵉpaṯ* is attested only in Jgs. 1:17.[41] The PNs *ṣᵉpô* (Gen. 36:11,15) = *ṣᵉpî* (1 Ch. 1:36) and *ṣipyôn* (Gen. 46:16) = *ṣᵉpôn* (Nu. 26:15) probably do not derive from *ṣph*.

IV. LXX and Qumran. The LXX translates the active participle of *ṣph* (qal/piel) in its function as a professional designation as *skopós* (exceptions include Isa. 52:8 with *phylássontes,* "guards"; Mic. 7:4, "day of watching," *skopiá;* similarly also Nu. 23:14). The corresponding verb, *(apo)skopeúō,* is used in 1 S. 4:13; Prov. 15:3; Cant. 7:5(4); Lam. 4:17; Hab. 2:1; Nah. 2:2(1). The LXX translates the remaining occurrences with various expressions from the broad spectrum of Greek *verba videndi,* including *ana-/epiblépō* (Ps. 66:7; Mic. 7:7; Sir. 11:12; 51:7), *epidéō* (Gen. 31:49; Jer. 31:19 = 48:19 MT), *ephoráō* (Ps. 5:4[3]), *katanoéō* (Ps. 37:32). In Job 15:22 the LXX uses *entéllō.* The LXX translates the noun *miṣpeh* as *skopiá* (2 Ch. 20:24; Isa. 21:8 + *kyríou*) or *skopḗ* (Sir. 37:14), verbally circumscribes *ṣippîyâ* in Lam. 4:17 *(aposkopeúō),* and translates the place-name *miṣpâ* in Gen. 31:49 as *hórasis,* "seeing."

The verb *ṣph* occurs in Qumran catalogs of virtues and vices. The teacher of the community shall delight in God's word "and 'shall watch' always for the judgment of God" (1QS 9:25). The apostates will be judged harshly because "they sought smooth things and preferred illusions and they 'watched for' breaks" (CD 1:18). 1QH 12:21 speaks about hoping in God's goodness, while 4Q171 3-10, IV, 8 picks up Ps. 37:32 and applies it to the wicked priest and teacher of righteousness. The term also occurs in 4Q511 42:5.

V. *ṣph* II. The root *ṣph* II corresponds to Ugar. *ṣpy,* "to cover."[42] Nominal derivatives include *ṣippûy,* "plating," and *ṣepeṯ,* "capital."[43] In this sense the term *ṣph* means to "cover, adorn, or overlay something [with wood, 1 K. 6:15; a glaze, Prov. 26:23; and esp. metal]."

The verb is attested only in the piel/pual[44] and occurs 45 times in the OT, 25 of which are found in the instructions for building the Sinai sanctuary and in the corre-

---

39. O. Keel, *Song of Songs* (Eng. trans. 1994), 236; idem, *Deine Blicke,* 32-45.
40. See K. Elliger, *BHHW,* II, 1228-29; *HAL,* II, 624.
41. Concerning its identity see *HAL,* III, 1051a. On the place-name *ṣᵉpaṯâ* in 2 Ch. 14:9(10) see Welten, 131 n. 91.
42. *WUS,* no. 2343; *UT,* no. 2184. Concerning related terms in neighboring languages see *HAL,* III, 1045a.
43. *HAL,* III, 1045b, 1051a.
44. On Isa. 21:5 and Ps. 5:4(3), see II and III.1 above, respectively.

I. Meaning, Etymology. The word *ṣāpôn* occurs 152 times in the MT and often means "the north," though it referred originally to a holy mountain located on the northern Syro-Palestinian border, where it constituted an unmistakable natural boundary. The oldest witnesses to this toponym are in the mythological literature of Ugarit (the *ṣa-pù-núm*[ki] attested in an Eblaite text[1] should probably be read *za-bù-lum*[ki], lit. "residence," in agreement with the meaning of Heb. → זבול *z*[e]*ḇûl*). The mountain called *ṣpn* in Ugaritic texts and *ḫazi* in syllabic cuneiform texts is in fact the mountain

---

des Noṣaïrîs (Paris, 1900), esp. 128ff.; J. Ebach, "Kasion," *LexÄg*, III, 354; O. Eissfeldt, *Baal, Zaphon, Zeus Kasios und der Durchzug der Israeliten durchs Meer. Beiträge zur Religionsgeschichte des Altertums* 1 (Halle, 1932); idem, "Ba'al Ṣaphon von Ugarit und Amon von Ägypten," *FuF* 36 (1962) 338-40 = *KlSchr*, IV (1968), 53-57; A. L. Fontaine, "Les localisations de l'Exode et la critique littéraire par H. Cazelles," *Bulletin de la Société d'études historiques et géographiques de l'Isthme de Suez* 6 (1955-56) 159-70; A. García y Bellido, "Deidades semitas en la España antigua," *Sefarad* 24 (1964) 12-40, 237-75, esp. 268-70; H. Gese, "Die Religionen Altsyriens," in Gese, M. Höfner, and K. Rudolph, *Die Religionen Altsyriens, Altarabiens und der Mandäer, RM* X/2 (1970), esp. 123-28; M. Görg, "'Syrien' und 'Griechenland' in einer späten ägyptischen Liste," *BN* 23 (1984) 14-17; C. Grave, "The Etymology of Northwest Semitic ṣapānu," *UF* 12 (1980) 221-29; idem, "Northwest Semitic ṣapānu in a Break-up of an Egyptian Stereotype Phrase in EA 147," *Or* 51 (1982) 161-82; O. Gruppe, "Typhon — Zephon," *Philologus* 48 (1889) 487-97; H. S. Haddad, "'Georgic' Cults and Saints of the Levant," *Numen* 16 (1969) 21-39; H. Klengel, *Geschichte Syriens im 2. Jahrtausend vor unserer Zeit*, III (Berlin, 1970), esp. 32-35; R. De Langhe, *Les textes de Ras Shamra-Ugarit et leurs rapports avec le milieu biblique de l'AT* II (Paris, 1945), esp. 217-44; A. Lauha, *Zaphon: Der Norden und die Nordvölker im AT. AnAcScFen* B 49 (1943); E. Lipiński, *El's Abode: Mythological Traditions Relating to Mount Hermon and to the Mountains of Armenia. OLP* 2 (1971), 13-69, esp. 58-64; O. Mowan, "Quatuor montes sacri in Ps. 89,13?" *VD* 41 (1963) 11-20; C. F. Nims and R. C. Steiner, "A Paganized Version of Psalm 20:2-6 from the Aramaic Text in Demotic Script," *JAOS* 103 (1983) 261-74; P. Peeters, "S. Barlaam du Mt Casius," *MUSJ* 3 (1909) 805-16; H. Y. Priebatsch, "Wanderungen und Wandelungen einer Sage: Von Ugarit nach Hellas," *UF* 16 (1984) 257-66; J. J. M. Roberts, "Ṣāpōn in Job 26,7," *Bibl* 56 (1975) 554-57; A. Robinson, "Zion and Saphon in Ps XLVIII,3," *VT* 24 (1974) 118-23; W. Röllig, "Ḫazzi," *RLA*, IV, 241-42; A. Salač, "Ζεὺς Κάσιος," *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 46 (1922) 160-89; J. de Savignac, "Étude sur l'équivalence Baal — Seth — Typhon — Ṣâphôn," *La Nouvelle Clio* 5 (1953) 216-21; idem, "Note sur le sens du terme ṣāphōn dans quelques passages de la Bible," *VT* 3 (1953) 95-96; idem, "Le sens du terme Ṣaphôn," *UF* 16 (1984) 273-78; C. F. A. Schaeffer, "Les fouilles de Ras Shamra-Ugarit," *Syr* 19 (1938) 313-34, esp. 323-27; E. von Schuler, "Ḫazzi," *WbMyth*, I, 171-72; R. Stadelmann, *Syrisch-palästinensische Gottheiten in Ägypten. Probleme der Ägyptologie* 5 (Leiden, 1967), esp. 32-47; F. Vian, "Le mythe de Typhée et le problème de ses origines orientales," *Éléments orientaux dans la religion grecque ancienne* (Paris, 1960), 17-37; C. Virolleaud, "La montagne du Nord dans les poèmes de Ras Shamra," *Babyloniaca* 17 (1937) 145-55; S. P. Vleeming and J. W. Wesselius, "An Aramaic Hymn from the Fourth Century B.C.," *BiOr* 39 (1982) 501-9; idem, *Studies in Papyrus Amherst 63 I* (Amsterdam, 1985); E. Weber, "Zeus Kasios und Zeus Sarapis," *Wiener Studien* 87 (1974) 201-7; P. Xella, "Baal Safon in KTU 2.23. Osservazioni epigrafiche," *Rivista di studi fenici* 15 (1987) 111-14; J. Yoyotte and P. Chuvin, *Les avatars de Zeus Casios de Péluse à Tivoli. Bulletin de la Société Ernest-Renan* (1986); P. J. van Zijl, *Baal. AOAT* 10 (1972), esp. 332-36; G. Zuntz, "On the Etymology of the Name Sappho," *Museum Helveticum* 8 (1951) 12-35.

1. *MEE* I, no. 1080.

classical authors call *Kásion* or Casios, modern Jebel el-'Aqra', the "bare mountain." At a height of 1,770 m. (5,750 ft.) above sea level, this mountain dominates the surrounding region and can be seen from the area around Ras Shamra (Ugarit), which is located some 40 km. (25 mi.) directly south. Its imposing silhouette has always prompted it to be viewed as a sacred mountain.

The exact meaning of the word *ṣpn* is disputed. Although *ṣāpôn* was initially thought to be the name of a city, in 1932 O. Eissfeldt identified it with Jebel el-'Aqra' and associated the word with Heb. *ṣāpâ*, "keep lookout, watch," since the mountain was viewed as a kind of observation post. By contrast, J. de Savignac continued to advocate a derivation from *ṣāp̱an*, "conceal, hide," as already attested in 1 En. 77:4, according to which *ṣāpôn* is the name of the cloud-filled heavens and then the name of a mountain that holds the clouds firm. C. Grave views *ṣāpôn* as referring originally to the north wind (cf. Cant. 4:16); it was then allegedly expanded to refer to the north in general and ultimately to the mountain bordering the northern horizon. E. Lipiński associates *ṣpn* with *ṣûp*, "swim, flood," and assumes that this name could be transferred to a mountain only because it had in the meantime become the seat of a deity, the "Lord of Flowing" or "Lord of Seafaring," *'il ṣpn* or *b'l ṣpn*. Any search for an etymology is burdened by the reduplication of *p* in Jewish Aram. *ṣippûn*.

In all likelihood, popular folk etymology older than 1 En. 77:4 established a connection between *ḫazi*, which recalls *ḥzh*, "see," and *ṣpn*, which recalls *ṣph*, "observe, look," because the mountain was viewed as a "lookout point." According to the Hittite myth of Ullikumis, the storm god Teshub watches from the top of Mt. Hazzi, the stone monster his father generated to revenge his loss of power.[2] The list of nations in Gen. 10 later groups the nations according to their geographical location apparently from the perspective of Mt. Zaphon, which even in Job 26:7 is still viewed as the center of the surrounding world. The fourteen (7 x 2) descendants of Japheth inhabit the northern region, Asia Minor, and the adjoining islands; the twenty-eight (7 x 4) sons of Ham live in the southern region, in Africa, Palestine, Phoenicia, and the neighboring Arabian regions; the twenty-eight (7 x 4) sons of Shem live in the east, especially in Mesopotamia and in southeastern Arabia. No nation settles in the west because this portion of the earth is covered by the Mediterranean Sea. The distribution of the seventy nations (Dt. 32:8-9), whose number coincides with that of the sons of the gods,[3] similarly seems to take its orientation from the perspective of the mountain where they assembled (Isa. 14:13) and from where the surrounding area can be surveyed the way Abraham does from Ramath-Hazor (1QapGen 21:8-12).

II. The Holy Mount Jebel el-'Aqra'. In the Ugaritic poems of the Ba'al cycle, Zaphon is the place where Ba'al is enthroned and is thus called the "Mount of Ba'al."[4] Later ritual texts also mention "'Anat of Zaphon," *'nt ṣpn*, and a "goddess of Zaphon,"

2. *ANET*, 123b.
3. *KTU* 1.4, VI, 46.
4. *WUS*, no. 2345; *KTU* 1.16, I, 6-7 (*ANET*, 147a, KRT C, ll. 6-7); II.45.

The tariff for offerings at his temple is well known,[14] and though the location of that temple has not been determined, the promontory of Sidi bu Saïd provides ideal conditions for a sanctuary dedicated to a patron deity of seafarers.

The cult of Ba'al Zaphon spread south, and several witnesses to its existence in Egypt, particularly in the region of Pelusium, have been found. One papyrus shows that the cult of the "barque *(ìnì)* of Ba'al Zaphon" was already established in Memphis in the 13th century,[15] though it actually referred to the northern Ba'al Zaphon. A stela unearthed in Ugarit was also dedicated to him with an inscription in Egyptian hieroglyphs.[16] By contrast, a Phoenician papyrus from Egypt refers to the southern Ba'al of Zaphon and dates to the 6th century; it refers to the god *b'l ṣpn* mentioned before "all the deities of Tahpanhes" (Tell Defneh), a town in the eastern Nile delta familiar from Jer. 2:16; 43:7-9; 44:1; 46:14; Ezk. 30:18, and the Cairo Papyrus in demotic script.[17] The "priestly" itinerary in Ex. 14:2,9; Nu. 33:7 also dates to the 6th century and mentions the place-name Baal-zephon *(b'l ṣpn) prior to the crossing of the Reed Sea.* The Pap. Amherst Eg. 63 contains an invocation petitioning "may Ba'al bless from the Zaphon," identifying Ba'al Zaphon with Horus.[18] This Zaphon is clearly recognizable as that from the region of Pelusium,[19] which Strabo's description[20] enables us to locate on the high dune of Ras Qaṣrūn, which is now called el-Gels, 55 km. (34 mi.) east of Pelusium (Tell Farama) and 40 km. (25 mi.) east of Tell el-Maḥammadiye, the ancient Gerra. This dune is situated on the sandbar separating Lake Sirbonis (Sabkhat Bardawil) from the Mediterranean Sea and on a clear day is visible from 40 km. (25 mi.) away. Small temples were dedicated to Ba'al Zaphon in Pelusium and in Tell el-Maḥammadiye, where a Nabatean inscription was dedicated to him.[21] Finally, he was also the primary god of Tahpanhes.

During the Hellenistic and Roman period, Ba'al Zaphon became Zeus Casios, the latter term deriving from the mountain name Hazzi, which remained in use from the 2nd millennium B.C.E. This god thus remains associated with the same locales, namely, "Mt. Casios" in Syria, some 30 km. (19 mi.) from the Seleucid capital Antioch, and "Mt. Casios" in Egypt, on the high dune of Ras Qaṣrūn or el-Gels.

Zeus Casios remained a storm god renowned for his fight against the sea monster, now called Typhon (Typhoeus), whose name and various features derive from Zaphon.[22] Zeus Casios was further a patron god of seafaring, and it was to the considerable trade between Antioch and Alexandria that he owed his popularity. Offerings, amulets, anchors, and votive imagery in the form of ships attest his cult in Delos,

---

14. *KAI* 69.
15. Pap. Sallier IV, verso 1, 5-6; cf. *ANET,* 250a, which reads *Meni* rather than *ìnì.*
16. *ANEP,* no. 485; *ANET,* 249.
17. Pap. Cairo 31169, no. x + 69.
18. Pap. Amherst Eg. 61, VII, 2-3; XII, 15-16.
19. See Pap. Cairo 31169, no. x + 75 *(ḏpn).*
20. Strabo 16.2.32-33.
21. *RES,* 1387.
22. *RÄR,* 132-43.

Corfu, Sicily, Spain, and even as far afield as Heddernheim in Germany.[23] Considering that the cult of Baʿal Zaphon endured for centuries, it must have been of enormous significance for the inhabitants of the Syrian coast.

IV. Sacred Mount Zaphon in the OT. Mythological use of *ṣāpôn* in the OT is characterized by the expression *yarkᵉṯê ṣāpôn* (Ps. 48:3[2]; Isa. 14:13; Ezk. 38:6,15; 39:2) corresponding probably to *ṣrrt ṣpn* of Ugaritic myths.[24] Both *ṣrrt* and *yrkt* characterize something as extremely distant, remote, and virtually inaccessible. With reference to a mountain, the focus is generally on the summit, as is the case with *har-ṣîyôn yarkᵉṯê ṣāpôn* in Ps. 48:3(2), "Mt. Zion, summit of Zaphon,"[25] especially compared with Isa. 2:2 = Mic. 4:1, where Zion "shall be raised above the tops of the mountains" *(bᵉrōʾš hehārîm).* The imagery in Isa. 14:13 similarly concurs with this notion, since the "oppressor" (*nōgēś,* 14:4b) intends to "ascend to heaven" and sit *bᵉyarkᵉṯê ṣāpôn,* i.e., apparently "on the summit of Zaphon." The contrasting notion is the *yarkᵉṯê ḇôr* (14:15), the "uttermost depths" extending even into the underworld.

In Ezk. 38:6,15 the final redactor of Ezk. 38–39 has inserted *yarkᵉṯê ṣāpôn* in order to bestow mythological features on the figure of Gog, king of Lydia. This particular redactor is clearly not the author of the vision in Ezk. 1, who uses the name Zaphon once (Ezk. 1:4) and follows Ps. 48:3(2) in making the divine mountain into Yahweh's own dwelling place. The storm in which Yahweh's chariot throne appears recalls the mythical scenery associated with Mt. Zaphon. Ezk. 1:4 represents one of the earliest literary witnesses in this regard: "A storm wind came from Zaphon, a great cloud with brightness around it and fire flashing forth continually." The author of Prov. 25:23 similarly attests how "the wind from Zaphon produces rain," and in traditions from the classical period Typhon (i.e., Zaphon) does indeed appear as the place where winds, storms, and lightning originate. Less than a century after Ezekiel, Aeschylus describes the "impetuous" Typhon as "hissing forth terror from his horrid throat, whilst Gorgonian fires flamed from his eyes, as if to take by violence the very throne of Zeus."[26] In Ezk. 1 the storm thundering in from Zaphon surrounds Yahweh's chariot throne, a notion probably deriving from the understanding of Baʿal Zaphon as the "Rider of the Clouds" *(rkb ʿrpt),*[27] an expression Ps. 68:5(4) already applies to Yahweh.

V. The North. The OT generally refers to the north with the expression *śᵉmōʾl* (Gen. 14:15; Josh. 19:27; Job 23:9; Ezk. 16:46), lit. "the left," since one's orientation was established while facing east. In addition, the name of the sacred Mt. Zaphon came to be used in the sense of "north" because it constituted the northern boundary of Syro-Palestine. The secondary character of this usage can still be discerned in expressions such as *ʾereṣ ṣāpôn,* "land of Zaphon" (Jer. 3:18; 6:22; 10:22; 16:15; 23:8; 31:8; 46:10;

23. *CIL,* XIII, 7330.
24. *KTU* 1.3, I, 21-22 par.
25. See Robinson.
26. *Prometheus Bound* 351-52.
27. *KTU* 1.2, IV, 8, etc.; *ANET,* 132b (iii, 10-11) etc.

50:9; Zech. 2:10(6); 6:6,8[bis]; CD 7:14), *dere̱k ṣāpônâ* or *dere̱k haṣṣāpôn*, "direction of Zaphon" (Ezk. 8:5[bis]; 40:20,44,46; 41:11; 42:1,11), *pᵉ'aṯ ṣāpôn*, "Zaphon's side" (Ex. 26:20; 27:11; 36:25; 38:11; Ezk. 47:15,17; 48:16,30), *gᵉḇûl ṣāpôn*, "boundary of Zaphon" (Nu. 34:7,9; 35:5). The construction also regularly occurs with *he locale*, especially in place-names (Gen. 13:14; 28:14; Ex. 40:22; Lev. 1:11; Nu. 2:25; 3:35; Dt. 2:3; 3:27; Josh. 13:3; 15:5,7,8,10,11; 17:10; 18:12,16,18,19[bis]; 19:27; Jgs. 12:1; 1 K. 7:25; 2 K. 16:14; 1 Ch. 9:24; 26:14,17; 2 Ch. 4:4; Jer. 1:13,15; 3:12; 23:8; 46:6; Ezk. 8:3,5,14; 9:2; 21:3 [20:47]; 40:40; 46:9,19; 47:2,15,17; 48:1[bis],10,17,31; Dnl. 8:4; Zech. 14:4).

It is striking that several poetic books, characterized by an archaic vocabulary, do not use the word *ṣāpôn* in the sense of "north." Such is especially the case in Psalms, Job, and Proverbs. The *ṣāpôn* in Ps. 48:3(2) and 89:13(12) is instead the sacred mountain, while 107:3 juxtaposes *ṣāpôn* and *yām*, "sea," in a mythological or geographical sense circumventing the meaning "north." Indeed, on the one hand the struggle between Ba'al Zaphon and Yamm, the god of the sea, may account for the mythological origin of the pair *ṣāpôn-yām*, though on the other hand the mention of a governor of *māt tâmti ṣa-pu-nu* in a Neo-Assyrian letter (ca. 675 B.C.E.)[28] supports the existence of a region of Zaphon along the Mediterranean coast, since *ṣa-pu-nu* in apposition to *māt tâmti* here refers not to the "north"[29] but rather constitutes an equivalent to the ancient *tâmtu ša Amurri*, the "Sea of Amurru." One might also note that *ṣāpôn* and *yām* are also juxtaposed in Isa. 49:12, where they constitute a contrast to the "land of the Sinim," i.e., the people from Aswan in Egypt. This juxtaposition apparently represents a fixed word pair associating Zaphon with the sea but whose exact origin cannot be determined. Job 26:7 recalls the "stretching out" of the sacred mountain over primeval chaos, while *ṣpwn* in Job 37:22 is to be read as *ṣāpûn* (cf. Job 20:26), "out of a hiding place comes golden splendor."

VI. The Enemy from the North. According to a whole series of biblical texts, the enemy will come from the north (Isa. 14:31; Jer. 1:13-15; 4:6; 6:1,22; 10:22; 13:20; 15:12; 46:20,24). Contrary to the opinion of some interpreters, this usage does not seem to be associated with any mythological connotations as is Mt. Zaphon in Ps. 48:3(2); 89:13(12); Isa. 14:13; Ezk. 1:4, and reflects rather a simple fact of experience: the enemies of Israel and Judah, be they Assyrians, Aramaeans, or Babylonians, came from the north. The north was also where first the Israelites and later the Judeans were deported and whence they will also return home (Jer. 3:12,18; 16:15; 23:8; 31:8). The normal route taken by the advancing armies of the Assyrians and Babylonians led through the "great arc" of the Euphrates, and it is with this region that Jer. 46:6-10 explicitly associates the "north." In these texts the north is merely one of the four points of the compass or a region north of Palestine itself. Such probably also applies to Jer. 25:26, which speaks in a vague and imprecise fashion about a "King of Zaphon" (cf. 1QM 1:4).

---

28. *ABL*, 540, r. 7.

29. Contra M. Dietrich, *Die Aramäer Südbabyloniens in der Sargonidenzeit (700-648)*. *AOAT* 7 (1970), 161 n. 1.

VII. The King of ṣāpôn. Dnl. 11 employs the determinative *ha-* in using *ṣāpôn* as a precise reference to a Seleucid ruler in Antioch, modern Antakya, 30 km. (19 mi.) from Mt. Zaphon. The "king of the north/of Zaphon" (*meleḵ haṣṣāpôn,* Dnl. 11:6) and the opposing "king of the south" (*meleḵ hanneḡeḇ,* v. 5) apparently represent cover names referring in reality to the Seleucid and Ptolemaic monarchs whose history from 312 to 168 or 164 Dnl. 11 outlines. One might recall in this context Seleucus I Nicator (Conqueror) (312-281 B.C.E.), the founder of the Seleucid dynasty, who made an offering to Zeus Casios on the summit of Mt. Zaphon on April 23, a date that then became the traditional feast day,[30] and that he made Seleucia at the foot of Mt. Zaphon the capital of his kingdom. Later Seleucid coins depict the symbol of the Zeus Casios cult, a semispherical Baityl to whom they sometimes add the name *Zeús Kásios,* clearly showing that the hellenized Ba'al Zaphon was the city's patron deity. It was soon replaced as capital by the harbor city Antioch. Although H. Ailloud assumes that Zeus Casios thus became the god of Antioch, this assertion has not been proven.[31] In any event the god of Zaphon did occupy an important enough position in the Seleucid pantheon for the Seleucids to bear the archaizing title "King of Zaphon" in Dnl. 11. Dnl. 11:5 doubtless refers to Seleucus I Nicator, whose grandson Antiochus II Theos (261-246 B.C.E.) 11:6 calls the "King of Zaphon." The "King of Zaphon" in 11:7-9 is Seleucus II Callinicus (246-225 B.C.E.), and the one in 11:11-19 is Antiochus III the Great (223-187 B.C.E.). The remaining Seleucids no longer bear this title, which occurs again only in 11:40, which speaks of the events "at the time of the end" supposed to coincide with the rule of Antiochus IV Epiphanes (175-164 B.C.E.), whose end 11:45 predicts. The use of *ṣāpôn* without an article in 11:44 refers to the geographical north and alludes perhaps to events in Asia Minor.

VIII. Qumran. The term *ṣpwn* occurs with a rather peculiar distribution in the Qumran writings. Whereas it is missing in the larger scrolls, except 1QM 1:4 ("war against the kings of the Zaphon") and CD 7:14 (*'ereṣ ṣāpôn* as the place of deliverance for those who endure), it occurs in the meaning "north of" in the Copper Scroll 3Q15 (13 times) identifying the location of the "treasure depots," and in 11QT (12 times) providing various points of orientation in relation to the temple. This same technical use of the term recurs in sale contracts from Wadi Murabba'ât, where *ṣpwn* is used to identify boundaries in real estate descriptions (Mur 22:1-9,3,12; 30:4,17). The apocryphal prophecy 2Q23 1,9 is the only text picking up on statements such as Isa. 14:31 and Jer. 46:20,24, which identify the north as the place from which enemies will come.

IX. ṣᵉpônî. The meaning of the hapax legomenon *haṣṣᵉpônî,* "the northerner," in Joel 2:20 is disputed.[32] Some interpreters have understood it as a reference to locusts,

30. J. Malalas, *Chronographia,* 9.199; cf. J. C. de Moor, "Ugaritica V," *UF* 2 (1970) 306.
31. Suetonius, *Vies des douze Césars,* ed. M. Ailloud (Paris, 1932), "Nero," 22.
32. See *HAL,* III, 1047a.

though in the Near East these animals do not come in from the north. W. Rudolph believes that the passage may represent "a piece of esoteric Zion theology" according to which Yahweh dwells on Zaphon/Zion and the enemy is his tool.[33] The expression may, however, refer to the "enemy from the north" (cf. Jeremiah) and already possess apocalyptic overtones.[34]

Lipiński

33. W. Rudolph, *Joel-Amos-Obadja — Jona. KAT* XIII/2 (1971), 64-65.

34. Cf. also H. W. Wolff, *Joel and Amos* (Eng. trans. 1977), 62-63; for a survey of scholarship, see A. S. Kapelrud, *Joel Studies* (Uppsala, 1948), 93-108.

צִפּוֹר *ṣippôr;* צָפַר *ṣāpar*

Contents: I. 1. Semitic Languages; 2. Homonymous Roots; 3. Occurrences; 4. LXX. II. Meanings: 1. Sparrow; 2. Small (Sparrow) Bird; 3. All Birds. III. Cultic Considerations: 1. Prohibition of Images; 2. Dietary Laws; 3. Offerings. IV. Metaphors: 1. Bird Hunting; 2. Comparisons from Nature. V. Theological Aspects. VI. Qumran.

I. 1. *Semitic Languages.* The root **ṣpr,* which onomatopoeically imitates the twittering or chirping of a bird, appears in most of the Semitic languages in the meaning "sparrow, small bird." Examples include Biblical Heb. and Middle Heb. *ṣippôr* (1QH 4:9; 11QT 65:2; 4Q511 97:1),[1] Sam. Heb. *ṣibbōr,*[2] Pun. *ṣpr,*[3] Deir 'Alla Can. *ṣpr.*[4]

ṣippôr. K. Albrecht, "Das Geschlecht der hebräischen Hauptwörter," *ZAW* 16 (1896) 41-121, esp. 71-72; W. Baumgartner, "Das semitische Wort für 'Vogel,'" *TZ* 5 (1949) 315-16; G. R. Driver, "Birds in the OT I/II," *PEQ* 86/87 (1955) 5-20, 129-40, esp. 6, 130-31; B. Landsberger, *The Fauna of Ancient Mesopotamia. MSL* VIII/2 (1962), 145-46.

On biblical and (ancient) Near Eastern ornithology: → יונה *yônâ,* VI, 32-40; → נשׁר *nešer,* X, 77-85; H. Buchberger, "Vogel," *LexÄg,* VI, 1046-51; *AuS,* VI, 78ff., 95-99, 314-43; VII, 247-90; D. Fehling, "Noch einmal der passer solitarius," *Philologus* 113 (1969) 217-24; O. Keel, *Symbolism of the Biblical World* (Eng. trans. 1978), 89-95 (the hunt), 190-92 (the wings of God; ills. 260-62); O. Keel, M. Küchler, and C. Uehlinger, *Orte und Landschaften der Bibel,* I (Zurich, 1984), esp. 100ff., 137ff., 154ff., 173ff.

1. *HAL,* III, 1047; Jastrow, 1295-96.

2. A. Murtonen, *Materials for a Non-Masoretic Hebrew Grammar,* II (Helsinki, 1960), 175.

3. *DNSI,* II, 973; in *KAI* 69.12, perhaps "perfume" (see I.2 regarding *ṣpr* IV); cf. M. Delcor, "Àpropos du sens de ṣpr dans le tarif sacrificiel de Marseille," *Sem* 33 (1983) 33-39.

4. *ATDA,* 174, 204, 307.

Scholars are unsure whether Phoen. *ršp ṣprm* in the bilingual Karatepe inscription means "Rašap of the he-goats" (Luwian hieroglyph "deer god"; in Egyptian iconography with the head of a gazelle) or "Rašap of the birds" (*ṣp[y]r,* "he-goat," is otherwise attested only late; Job 5:7, *ûḇᵉnê-Rešep jagbîhû ʿûp,* "just as sons of Resheph [birds of misfortune? others, e.g., NRSV, translate "sparks"] fly upward"; cf. Dt. 32:24 LXX; Sir. 43:14,18).[5] Aramaic includes Biblical Aram. and Jewish Aram. *ṣippar,*[6] Mand. *ṣipar,*[7] Christian Palestinian Aram. *ṣpr,*[8] Sam. *ṣprh,*[9] Egyp. Aram. *ṣnpr,*[10] and Syr. *ṣeppar.*[11] Arabic forms *ʿuṣfūr* with the *ʿayin* prefix; Ugar. *ʿṣr* and Akk. *iṣṣūru* also represent assimilated forms.[12]

The corresponding verb for "whistle, twitter," Jewish Aram. *ṣᵉpar,* Syr. *ṣᵉḇar,* Arab. *ṣafara,* Akk. *ṣabāru,* is not attested in Biblical Hebrew.[13]

2. *Homonymous Roots.* The root **ṣpr* II is to be distinguished etymologically from *ṣpr* I, "guard(?)," Jgs. 7:3 (text uncertain); cf. Middle Heb. *ṣᵉpîrâ,* "(body)guard," Ugar. *klb ṣpr,* "watch(?)dog";[14] perhaps also the PNs Heb. *ṣō(ô)par,* Ugar. *ṣpr(n) [-DN?];*[15] **ṣpr* III (Arab. *ḍafara*), "plait, weave," related to *ṣᵉpîrâ,* "thread, wreath,"[16] Isa. 28:5; uncertain in Ezk. 7:7,10; also *ṣippōren* (**ṣpr* IV), Dt. 21:12; Jer. 17:1; Biblical Aram. **ṭᵉpar,* Dnl. 4:30(Eng. 33); 7:19; Arab. *ẓufur;* Akk. *ṣupru,* "nail";[17] and *ṣāpîr,* "he-goat," 2 Ch. 29:21; Ezr. (6:17 Aram.); 8:35; Dnl. 8:5,8,21; Neh. 5:18 LXX, which is occasionally (already inconsistent in Tg.) explained as a later, aramaizing secondary form of *śāʿîr.*[18] Of course, one translator might already have understood Phoen. *ṣprm* to mean "deer."[19]

3. *Occurrences.* In the OT the terms *ṣippôr* (40 times) and *ṣippar* (4 times) occur 18 times in the Pentateuch (13 of which are in Lev. 14), once each in Nehemiah and Job,

---

5. → רשׁף *ršp; KAI* 26A.II.11-12; cf. in this regard M. Weippert, "Elemente phönikischer und kilikischer Religion in den Inschriften vom Karatepe," *Vorträge. ZDMGSup* 1 (1969), 191-217, esp. 207-8 (bibliog.).

6. *KBL²,* 1116; Jastrow, 1298b.

7. *MdD,* 394.

8. F. Schulthess, *Lexicon Syropalaestinum* (Berlin, 1903), 172a.

9. R. Macuch, *Grammatik des samaritanischen Aramäisch* (Berlin, 1969), 272, 275.

10. See H. Bauer and P. Leander, *Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen* (1927; repr. 1962), §§3n, 43m'"; Beyer, 91-92.

11. *LexSyr,* 635.

12. Cf. *GK,* §§19m, 85w; Lane, I/5, 2064; cf. also Baumgartner, 315-16; *AHw,* I, 390, contra Landsberger, 145; *CAD,* XVI, 155; *WUS,* no. 2080; according to K. Aartun, "Neue Beiträge zum ugaritischen Lexikon (II)," *UF* 17 (1985) 11, there is also a homograph "wine cider"; *AHw,* I, 390; *CAD,* VII, 210-14.

13. **ṣpr* II; *HAL,* III, 1050b.

14. M. Dahood, "צפר (Jdc 7,3): 'to watch, guard,'" *Or* 29 (1960) 347-48; a different view is taken by Aartun, *UF* 17 (1985) 18.

15. Weippert, *Vorträge,* 215-16; additional suggestions in *HAL,* III, 1013 s.v. *ṣôpar,* 1050.

16. *HAL,* III, 1048, 1050.

17. *HAL,* III, 1051.

18. *GesTh,* II, 1183.

19. *KAI* 26A.II.11-12; see I.1 above.

7 times in the Psalms, 4 in Proverbs, twice in Ecclesiastes, once each in Isaiah and Lamentations, 3 times in Ezekiel, 4 in Daniel, and once each in Hosea and Amos. Of these occurrences, scholars generally date at least Gen. 15:10(J?); Dt. 22:6; Isa. 31:5; Hos. 11:11; Am. 3:5 to the preexilic period, and Lam. 3:52; Ezk. 39:4,17 to the exilic period (though some passages are disputed).

4. *LXX.* The LXX translates *ṣippôr* with *peteinón* (twice [without Daniel]; only pl.), *órneon* (15 times and Ezk. 17:23 variant), and the diminutives *orníthion* (13 times; only in Lev. 14) and *strouthíon* (7 times: 5 in the Psalms and once each in Ecclesiastes and Lamentations). It does not translate the glosses in Gen. 7:14 par. Ezk. 17:23.[20] In Neh. 5:18 its use of *chímaros* presupposes *ṣāpîr* (differently in Vulg.).

Whereas Theodotion translates all four passages in Daniel with *órneon,* the LXX twice uses *peteinón* (pl.); it does not translate 4:11 (=14 LXX), and uses *léōn* in 4:30 (=33b) (probably for *k*^{e}*pîr*).

II. Meanings. The feminine[21] Heb. term *ṣippôr* acquires different semantic nuances depending on the context.

1. *Sparrow.* The authors of the OT were familiar with a great many different birds (Lev. 11:13-19 par. Dt. 14:12-18; Job 38–39; Isa. 34:11-15; Zeph. 2:14, and many others) whose names often imitate the bird's call or offer some other clues to the bird's identity.[22] When *ṣippôr* parallels or contrasts with other kinds of birds, it has the meaning "sparrow" attested in neighboring languages and by the LXX's *strouthíon.* Parallel terms include *yônâ,* "dove," *d*^{e}*rôr,* "dove" or "swallow,"[23] *ḥ*^{a}*sîḏâ,* "stork," *kôs* II, "screech owl, little owl," *qāʾaṯ,* "owl, jackdaw, or something similar."[24]

Driver suspects that the bird "that is alone *(bôḏēḏ)* upon the housetop" in Ps. 102:8(7) is the blue rock thrush.[25] Both the line of thought and the parallelism of v. [6]7([5],6), however, have already been completed. Since v. 8(7) focuses on *šqd,* "being sleepless" (cf. Sir. 31:1), it may be better to follow some ms. traditions in reading *nôḏēḏ* instead (from → נדד *ndd,* "move restlessly, wander about, [flee]"; cf. Prov. 27:8; also Isa. 10:14; Ps. 55:7-8[6-7], and the related → נוד *nûḏ,* "flutter [away]," Ps.

---

20. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), 359.

21. Regarding apparent exceptions, see Albrecht, 71-72.

22. Surveys in Driver, 20, 140; cf. the Akkadian material in A. Salonen, *Vögel und Vogelfang im alten Mesopotamien. AnAcScFen* B 180 (1973), 296-302; Egyptian material in Buchberger, 1046-47, 1049 nn. 10, 16.

23. *HAL,* I, 230b.

24. Driver, 16; *HAL,* III, 1059-60; cf. also Deir ʿAlla (Balaam text) I, 10-11: *[b]ny nḥṣ wṣrh ʾprḥy ʾnph drr nšrt ywn wṣpr,* "the young ones of the *nḥṣ* and the owl, the young ones of the heron; the swallow, the birds of prey, the pigeon and the sparrow," which H. Ringgren, "Balaam and the Deir ʿAlla Inscription," *FS I. L. Seeligmann* (Jerusalem, 1984), 93-98, esp. 93-94, interpreted as harbingers of ill fortune; a different view is taken by H. P. Müller, "Die aramäische Inschrift von Deir ʿAlla und die älteren Bileamsprüche," *ZAW* 94 (1982) 214-44; J. A. Hackett, *The Balaam Text from Deir ʿAllā. HSM* 31 (1984), 29.

25. Driver, 6, 131.

quite ancient "taboos" (Ex. 23:19; Lev. 22:28). The (Dtr?) explanation in Dt. 22:7b draws the comparison with the human parent-child relationship (cf. 5:16).[35]

3. *Offerings.* Birds were commonly used as sacrificial animals in the ancient Near East.[36] In Ugaritic texts recipients *inš ilm* appear with striking frequency alongside individual gods (form of Rešep or "member of the gods"?[37]).

a. Lev. 14:2-7,48-53 twice describe a cathartic bird ritual involving "leprosy" *(nega'-haṣṣāra'aṯ)* on people and houses. One of two living, clean birds *(ṣippᵒrîm ḥayyôṯ ṭᵉhōrôṯ)*[38] is slaughtered *(šḥṭ)* and a purifying water made from the blood (cf. Nu. 19:6,9) and applied to the other bird and to the leprous person or house. As in similar rites of elimination (Lev. 16:10,21-22; Zech. 5:5-11),[39] the released *(šlḥ)* living animal removes the *materia peccans* that has been transferred to it.[40] Cultic-theological terminology used in this context includes → טהר *ṭhr,* "purify, cleanse," → חטא *ḥṭ'* piel, "free from sin," → כפר *kpr* piel, "atone."

According to v. 8, the ritual alone (as also in vv. 48-53) was originally probably sufficient and perhaps contributed to the healing (cf. *rp'* niphal, v. 48). In the present context, however, it comes after the healing (vv. 2-3,48-49) and requires an additional guilt offering for the person's cultic reintegration (vv. 10ff.).[41]

b. The narrative in Gen. 15:9-10 describes the offering of two birds (doves).[42]

IV. Metaphors. A rough estimate is that in about 80 OT passages, birds represent approximately a quarter of all metaphorical expressions from the animal world. Approximately one-fourth each involve *nešer,* "eagle, vulture," and references to "doves,"[43] about one-fifth the *ṣippôr,* and not quite half as many the *'ôp,* "winged animals." In 10 instances *ṣippôr* is associated with *kᵉ*.[44]

1. *Bird Hunting.* The OT frequently refers metaphorically to bird hunting. Passages limited to *ṣippôr* include the following semantic fields.

a. A living bird *(ṣippôr ḥayyâ)* still unable to fly can be taken *(lqḥ)* from the nest *(qēn).* Later the bird catcher *(yāqûš, yôqēš)* traps birds *(lkd, yqš)* with the spring trap

---

35. See O. Keel, *Das Böcklein in der Milch seiner Mutter und Verwandtes. OBO* 33 (1980), 44-45.

36. *CAD,* II, 213; *LexÄg,* IV, 594-95; *KAI* 69.11,12(?),15; *KTU* 1.41, 24, 36; 1.48, 1, 3, 18, etc.

37. *KTU* 1.39, 21-22; 1.41, 5-6, 27, 40, etc.; Rešep: P. Xella, "Le dieu Rashap à Ugarit," *AAAS* 29-30 (1979-80) 145-62; et al.; "member of the gods": M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, "*Anš(t)* und *(m)inšt* im Ugaritischen," *UF* 9 (1977) 50, etc.

38. See III.2 above.

39. *TUAT,* 282-88 (bibliog.); *KTU* 1.127, 29-31 (?).

40. B. Janowski, *Sühne als Heilsgeschehen. WMANT* 55 (1982), 211-12, 225 n. 204 (bibliog.).

41. Cf. K. Elliger, *Leviticus. HAT* IV (1966), 186ff.; M. Noth, *Leviticus. OTL* (1965), 107-8.

42. → יונה *yônâ,* VI, 38.

43. → יונה *yônâ,* VI, 32-40.

44. See in this regard E. Jenni, "דמה *dmh* to be like," *TLOT,* I, 340-41.

evoke the appearance of small birds. Place-names include *sepphōris* (Josephus, passim), *nisbe* **ṣpwry.*[53]

V. Theological Aspects. As their creator and preserver (cf. Gen. 7:14; Ps. 84:4[3]; 104:17; 148:10), Yahweh has placed birds under the power of human beings (Ps. 8:9[8]; cf. Gen. 1:28; 9:2-3), who may catch them, kill them, and eat them.[54] Before Yahweh, however, and despite their own status above animals, people themselves resemble a small bird (Hos. 11:11; cf. Isa. 31:5), though Yahweh is at most only linguistically comparable to protective bird parents (Isa. 31:5), since he neither can nor may be depicted substantively in the image of a bird (Dt. 4:17).[55]

Subjects similarly appear as defenseless birds over against the king or messiah depicted as a protective tree (Dnl. 4:9,11,18[12,14,21]; Ezk. 17:23). In judgment Yahweh can even reverse the relationship between human beings and animals (Ps. 8:7ff.) in that it is not human beings who eat or sacrifice birds;[56] instead, Yahweh now invites the animals to a sacrificial meal and feeds them *(ntn lᵉʾoḵlâ)* human beings (Ezk. 39:4,17; cf. Isa. 34:6-7; Zeph. 1:7).[57]

VI. Qumran. In 1QH 4:8-9 the lamenting petitioner compares himself with a bird that has been pushed from the nest.[58] 11QT 65:2 understands Dt. 22:6-7[59] contextually as a protective regulation for fellow Israelites.[60]

Schwab

---

53. Beyer, 677; cf. Akk. *Bīt Ṣupuri* in "Sidon," R. Dussaud, *Topographie historique de la Syrie antique et médiévale* (Paris, 1927), 39.

54. See III.2 and IV.1 above.

55. See W. H. Schmidt, *The Faith of the OT: A History* (Eng. trans. 1983), 98-100.

56. See III.3 above.

57. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1983), 308-9; → גוג *gôg (gôgh)*, II, 419-25.

58. → נדח *nāḏaḥ*, IX, 235-41.

59. See III.2 above.

60. J. Maier, *The Temple Scroll: An Intro., Trans., and Comm. JSOTSup* 34 (Eng. trans. 1985), 134-35.

stowal of good fortune for the upright. The term can be translated as "keep ready" or "store up" (read *yiṣpōn* with *Q*).

In what is probably a preexilic collection of sayings in 10:1–22:16, one finds in 10:14 the general conviction that "the wise lay up *(yiṣpōnû)* knowledge *(da'aṯ),*" while the "babbling of a fool brings ruin near." The wise apparently conceal knowledge so that it is not lost or destroyed by outsiders, whence the notion of "keeping, preserving" in this passage. Those who study God's law similarly "conceal" ("keep safe") God's word in their hearts (Ps. 119:11, *b^elibbî ṣāpantî 'imrāṯeḵā*). Prov. 13:22b also uses *ṣpn* in the sense of "keep, store up" ("the sinner's wealth is laid up for the righteous [*ṣāpûn l^e*]"), an insight deriving apparently from the notion of the act-consequence schema according to which the righteous will ultimately do well at the expense of sinners, who must ultimately perish. The righteous have access to "hidden" fortune even if they do not possess it at the moment.

The saying in 27:16, appearing in the second collection of the officials of Hezekiah (chs. 25–29), is no longer entirely clear. Most interpreters understand it from the perspective of v. 15, while the LXX understands v. 16 to be an independent unit. From the perspective of v. 15, v. 16 must refer back to the "contentious woman" mentioned there (cf. the suffix) who can be restrained as little as can the wind itself (*ṣōp^enêhā* would have to be read as sg.). One might also understand the stich as a paronomasia in which the suffix refers to the following *rûaḥ* in the sense, "those who try to conceal it [must know what they are doing, they] conceal wind."

In two passages in an admonition (1:10-19), *ṣpn* is influenced by the par. *'rb* and understood as "lie in wait." The wicked lie in wait for the innocent (v. 11) though in so doing ultimately set an ambush for their own lives (v. 18; cf. the context). This meaning derives from the notion that those who intend to attack others are concealing themselves from the latter.

The book of Job uses *ṣpn* exclusively in the discourses of Job and his friends. The dispute concerning the functioning or nonfunctioning of the act-consequence schema raises *nolens volens* theological questions. In his suffering, which he understands as an expression of God's undeserved wrath, Job wishes to "conceal" himself from God in the underworld (*taṣpinēnî* par. *str* hiphil) until that wrath has passed and God again remembers him with kindness (14:13). Eliphaz addresses the possible temptation the righteous experience in the face of the wicked's good fortune by pointing out how the latter's happiness is only apparent; in reality the life of the wicked is wracked with torment "through all the years *(mispar šānîm)* that are laid up for the ruthless" (15:20). The predestinatory character of *ṣpn* here derives from the particular rhetorical and conceptual form used; the duration of this predetermined period of time is actually concealed from human beings (*ṣpn* niphal). The ruthless will escape neither the darkness nor the sword (15:22 cj.).[8] If the conjecture is correct, then the sentence means that the wicked are "stored up, kept" for the sword. The daily torment of the wicked mentioned

8. Cj. with *BHK*³, Fohrer, *Hiob*, 262, 264; Hesse, *Hiob*, 106, *ṣāpûn; BHS* and Horst, *Hiob 1*, 218, maintain MT *ṣāpû (K)* or *ṣāpûy (Q)*.

in v. 20 is that they are indeed ultimately aware of that end.[9] Because Job feels his friends do not understand him, they do not offer him much comfort. Nor can it be otherwise, since God has "hidden their hearts from understanding" (17:4). Here understanding is portrayed as a personal entity that will find no access to the friends' hearts, which God has hidden (*ṣpn* with *min*). The friends believe that the act-consequence schema is always in effect. Even if God does not punish the wicked themselves, he will surely punish their descendants, for he has "stored up" this punishment ("concealed it, kept it ready"). Job objects to this view and wishes instead that God would "keep" that punishment ready for the wicked themselves (21:19). Still he must lament, "why are (specific) times not kept hidden by the Almighty (*ṣpn* niphal)" during which God punishes the wicked so that those who do know God can see it (24:1)? Job insists on his innocence to both his friends and God by pointing out how he too has kept God's commandments (23:12, *bᵉḥêqî* [with LXX and Vulg. instead of *mēḥuqqî*] *ṣāpantî 'imrê pîw*). Job cannot understand why God would nonetheless turn against him, and accuses God of seeking to destroy, quite contrary to tradition and their rights, those who suffer. God allegedly "hid" in his heart (*'ēlleh ṣāpantā bilḇāḇeḵā,* 10:13) all the misfortune he had planned for Job.

In 20:26 *liṣpûnāyw,* "for his hidden ones," makes no sense and is emended following the LXX to *lô ṣāpûn.* The verse is part of Zophar's discourse concerning how misfortune inevitably comes upon the wicked (cf. v. 29).

3. *Theological Contexts.* The term *ṣpn* exhibits different meanings in the Psalter. The persecuted petitioner is confident that Yahweh will "hide" the oppressed in his shelter (27:5; 31:21[20]). The expression for protection is *bᵉsukkōh* or *bᵉsukkâ.* The context of 27:5 suggests that such shelter with Yahweh is rooted in the temple or sanctuary traditions, a notion supported by the entire scope of temple functions such as asylum, divine presence, and divine oracles. Those seeking refuge, although threatened by persecutors and slanderers, nonetheless trust in Yahweh's goodness, which he has "laid up" for those who fear him and trust in him (31:20[19], *ṣāpantā*). Ps. 10:2-11 describes the shameful actions of the wicked against the poor and innocent, pointing out how the ruthless "lie in wait" for the innocent (v. 8, *ṣpn* with *lᵉ;* subj. is *'ênāyw,* i.e., "his eyes lie in wait for someone"; instead of this difficult manner of expression, most comms. follow LXX and Syr. in emending to *yiṣpāyû* < *ṣph* I). Ps. 56:7(6) similarly describes the schemes of the wicked (cf. the context; alongside *ṣpn,* with *Q* qal, stand *gûr, šmr, qwh* piel; *BHS* considers the cj. *yiṣpāyûn* < *ṣph* I). The lament of the people in Ps. 83 speaks not of the wicked but of the enemies and adversaries of the people of God. V. 4(3) describes God's community with the peculiar expression "your hidden ones" (*ṣᵉpûneyḵā* par. *'ammᵉḵā*). Kraus understands this expression to mean "those entrusted to your care,"[10] a meaning certainly supported by the semantic field of *ṣpn.* The use of the qal passive participle in 17:14 *(Q)* is difficult to under-

9. Fohrer, *Hiob,* 273.
10. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150* (Eng. trans. 1989), 159, 162.

stand. The unjustly persecuted petitioner asks God to step in against his enemies, to fill their bellies with *ṣᵉpûnᵉḵā* so that even their descendants will be filled by it. "What you have stored up" can only refer to something bad (other interpreters read *ṣᵉpûnêḵā*, "those you protect").

The prophetic tradition occasionally uses *ṣpn* in establishing the guilt prompting an oracle of woe. After various oracles of woe, Hos. 13:12 summarily states that Ephraim's iniquity has been "bound up" *(ṣrr)* and its sin "kept in store" as incriminating evidence for judgment day. The prophet Jeremiah announces Jerusalem's and Judah's doom in the form of deportation, pointing out that the transgressions of the people of God cannot be "hidden" from Yahweh's eyes (Jer. 16:17, *lōʾ-niṣpan ʿᵃwōnām minneged ʿênāy*). An addendum (Ezk. 7:21-24) to Ezekiel's oracle concerning Yahweh's day of judgment (7:1-27) mentions the desecration and destruction of Jerusalem and its temple, with Yahweh referring in the first person to the city and/or temple as *ṣᵉpûnî*, "my hidden thing," i.e., "treasure"[11] (cf. Ps. 83:4[3], according to Aquila, Symmachus, Jerome, *ṣᵉpuneḵā* [sg.], "your hidden thing," "your treasure," here par. with "your people").

Obadiah's oracle of woe to Edom also uses *ṣpn*. In times of distress for the people of God, Edom chose the side of their enemy. Now, however, Edom will itself be brought down by disaster by being pillaged and plundered even into its last "hiding places" (Ob. 6, *maṣpunāyw*, the only substantive construction from *ṣpn*).

III. Qumran. The verb *ṣpn* has appeared in but one text from Qumran. In 4Q381 31:6 one should read *ṣpnym* as a qal passive participle in the sense of "store up, lay up" (cf. Job 15:20; 21:19; Ps. 31:20[19]; Cant. 7:14[13]). The psalm's author (a [former] king?) addresses the "God of my salvation" in a confession with the words: "the days of my existence are stored up/laid up (with you?)."[12]

Wagner†

11. *HAL*, III, 1049a.
12. See E. M. Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms from Qumran*. *HSS* 28 (1986), 132, 141.

b. The intransitive qal form occurs 33 times in the OT, once in the pual (Josh. 9:4, wineskins "patched together") and 11 times in the hiphil. It occurs primarily in the Dtr History and the Psalter (11 times each) and in the Chronicler's History (7 times).

2. *ṣar I.* The noun *ṣar* I, "narrowness, distress," occurs 15 times in the OT (without Isa. 63:9), including 6 times in Job, 4 in Isaiah, 3 in the Psalms, and in 1 S. 2:32 and Est. 7:4.[11] The adj. *ṣar* I, "narrow," occurs 5 times, including twice in Proverbs. One noteworthy feature is the preponderance of textually corrupt witnesses, including 1 S. 2:32; Job 36:16 (read *ṣar* II); 36:19; 41:7(15) (read *ṣōr* I); Est. 7:4 (read *ṣar* II); Isa. 30:20; 63:9 (read *ṣîr* II); and Prov. 24:10. These witnesses suggest that *ṣar* was used only sparingly during the preexilic period, then significantly more frequently during the exilic and postexilic periods. It is not a word used much in narrative, the exception being the Balaam story in Nu. 22:26, and is at home rather in prophecy and in devotional and wisdom literature.

Parallel terms and combinations with corresponding verbs make clear that the term *ṣar* I carries with it the distinct notion of spatial narrowness, of restriction in the sense of "having no space" (cf. similar connotations with → ישׁע *yšʿ*) (*māqôm ṣar,* Nu. 22:26; 2 K. 6:1; Isa. 49:20). Often the focus is on "expanding" that space (*rḥb* hiphil, Job 36:16; Ps. 4:2[1]; 118:5). With this spatial understanding as the point of departure, the notion is then applied to other spheres, e.g., *ṣar* becomes "distress" that comes upon (*mṣʾ,* Ps. 119:143) and frightens a person (*bʿt,* Job 15:24). In this sense *ṣar* can turn into tribulation (Job 38:23) with apocalyptic undertones (Isa. 26:15). In such situations the only food is the "bread of adversity" *(leḥem ṣar)* and the "water of affliction" (Isa. 30:20). Accompanying features include *māṣôq* (Ps. 119:143) *mûṣāq* (Job 36:16), *meṣûqâ,* "narrowness, affliction"[12] (Job 15:24), *qārāʾ,* "calling out" (Ps. 4:2[1]), and **ṣāqôn* (cj.), "tribulation, *thlípsis*" (Isa. 26:16), *ʿonîyâ,* "poverty," and *laḥaṣ,* "torment" (Job 36:15).

3. *ṣārâ I.* The term *ṣārâ* I occurs 70 times in the OT (disputed cjs. in Jer. 4:31; Zech. 10:11) and in Sir. 3:15. These witnesses seem to represent almost exclusively passages with direct discourse, generally of a solemn or formal nature (e.g., an oath formula in 2 S. 4:9; 1 K. 1:29). Accordingly, most of these witnesses occur in prayer contexts (24 times in the Psalms; twice in Dt. 31 [transition to the Song of Moses]; once in Jon. 2), in wisdom literature (7 times in Proverbs; twice in Job), and in prophecy (8 times in Jeremiah; 7 in Isaiah; twice each in Nahum and Obadiah; once each in Jonah, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, and Zechariah). The term also occurs 6 times in the Dtr History and 4 in the Chronicler's History. The 4 occurrences in the Pentateuch probably all belong to the Dtr or exilic literary stage. These findings suggest that with few exceptions, *ṣārâ* I belongs to the language of the exilic and postexilic periods. Its total absence from Priestly texts is striking, as is, by contrast, its use by Levites (cf. various

---

11. → צר *ṣar* II.
12. → צוק *ṣwq.*

psalms, also Neh. 9:27,37). After the OT period, *ṣārâ* I is found only in Qumran (see below).

The connotation of spatial narrowness also inheres in the meaning of *ṣārâ* I, and is apparent in Ps. 25:17, *hirḥîḇ ṣārôṯ*, "enlarge one's distress," or Ps. 31:8(7), which contrasts *ṣārâ* with *merḥaḇ*, "broad place" (cf. esp. 1QH 9:28). Parallels consistently confirm the meaning "distress, narrowness, affliction," e.g., *rā'â/rā'ôṯ*, "distress, troubles" (Dt. 31:17,21; 1 S. 10:19; Jer. 15:11), *tôḵēḥâ*, "punishment," *n*ᵉ*'āṣâ*, "disgrace" (2 K. 19:3; Isa. 37:3); *'*ᵒ*nî*, "misery, torment" (Ps. 31:8[Eng. 7]), *'ên mākkîr*, "no refuge" (142:5[4]), *m*ᵉ*ṣûqâ/ôṯ*, "distress" (25:17). When *ṣārâ* refers to distress brought about by one's enemies, par. terms include *ḥereḇ*, "sword," *deḇer*, "pestilence," *rā'āḏ*, "hunger" (2 Ch. 20:9), and helpless, trembling hands (Jer. 50:43). When it refers more broadly to cosmic tribulation and distress, parallels include *ḥôšeḵ*, "darkness," *m*ᵉ*'ûp ṣûqâ*, "oppressive darkness" (Isa. 8:22), *h*ᵃ*rôn 'ap*, "burning wrath," *za'am*, "rage" (Ps. 78:49; cf. also Zeph. 1:15 [see below]). In anthropological contexts par. terms include *yāgôn*, "torment, trouble," *ḥeḇlê-māweṯ*, "bonds of death," *m*ᵉ*ṣārê š*ᵉ*'ôl*, "fears of the underworld" (Ps. 116:3), *beṭen š*ᵉ*'ôl*, "depths of the underworld" (Jon. 2:3[2]), *śîaḥ*, "care, worry" (Ps. 142:3[2]), and *'êḏ*, "misfortune" (Ob. 12-13).

These semantic findings are also confirmed by antonyms, including *ma'ôz*, "refuge, shelter" (Ps. 37:39), *t*ᵉ*šû'â*, "help," *y*ᵉ*šû'â*, "salvation" (Ps. 91:16; Isa. 33:2), and *maḥ*ᵃ*seh*, "refuge" (Ps. 46:2[1]).

Combinations incorporating *ṣārâ* include *ṣārôṯ lēḇāḇ*, "narrowness/troubles of the heart" (Ps. 25:17), *ṣārôṯ nepeš*, "troubles of the soul" (Gen. 42:21; Ps. 31:8[7]), *'ereṣ ṣārâ*, "land of affliction" (Isa. 30:6; cf. Zech. 10:11 cj.), *'ēṯ ṣārâ*, "time of distress" (Ps. 37:39; Dnl. 12:1), *yôm ṣārâ*, "day of distress" (Ps. 50:15; 77:3[2]; Ob. 12).

To escape (*yāṣā' min*, Prov. 12:13) the imminent (*bô'*, Gen. 42:21; *qûm*, Nah. 1:9) *ṣārâ*, a person needs some sort of "help" (*hôšîa'*, Isa. 46:7; Ps. 34:7[6]), "deliverance" (*hiṣṣîl*, 1 S. 26:24; Job 5:19; Ps. 54:9[7]; *'zr* par. *pillēṭ*, Ps. 37:39-40; *ḥillēṣ*, Ps. 34:8[7]), "liberation" (*pāḏâ*, 2 S. 4:9; 1 K. 1:29; Ps. 25:22), "revivification" (*ḥyh*, Ps. 138:7; 143:11), and "grace" (*ḥānan*, Isa. 33:2).

4. *ṣ*ᵉ*rôr, etc.* The noun *ṣ*ᵉ*rôr* occurs 7 times in the OT and twice in Qumran. It occurs in connection with *kesep* as a "moneybag" (Gen. 42:35; Prov. 7:20) and with *haḥayyîm* as the "bundle of life/of the living" (1 S. 25:29; Sir. 6:16; 1QH 2:20). The term *mēṣar* occurs 3 times, *māṣôr* 8 times.

III. Theological Connotations.

1. *ṣārar I*. a. According to one ancient wisdom saying, honoring a fool is as meaningless as "binding" a stone in a sling (Prov. 26:8). Hosea sees how Ephraim's iniquity is "bound up" (Hos. 13:12), and how the wind has "wrapped" it up (4:19).[13] Before leaving Egypt, the Hebrews wrap up their kneading bowls (Ex. 12:34 JE). David "locks

13. Concerning this discussion, see C. Rabin, "Etymological Miscellanea," *ScrHier* 8 (1961) 398.

up" his concubines (2 S. 20:3). Isaiah "binds up" his testimony among his disciples (Isa. 8:16). According to the postexilic understanding of creation, Yahweh "binds up" the waters in his thick clouds (Job 26:8; cf. Prov. 30:4). Concerning 1 S. 25:29, see 4 below.

b. The occurrences of the intransitive qal clearly attest a process of semantic specialization. A bedspread is too "narrow" (Isa. 28:20), and a space (2 K. 6:1), a land (Isa. 49:19-20), or a step is similarly too "narrow" (Prov. 4:12; Job 18:7). Things get too "tight" for Jacob when Esau pursues him (Gen. 32:8[7]), as they do for Amnon in his desire for Tamar (2 S. 13:2), and for David in his lament over Jonathan's death (1:26), before the inhabitants of Ziklag (1 S. 30:6), and after the census (1 Ch. 21:13). The events of 587 cause personified Jerusalem to feel "anxious and distressed" (Lam. 1:20).

Although Isa. 25:4 uses *ṣārar* to describe the situation of the poor and the weak, even those with an abundance of wealth can fall into distress (Job 20:22). The petitioners' distress in the Psalms can be determined only contextually (31:10[9]; 59:17[16]; 66:14; 69:18[17]; 106:44). Such distress can move a person to repent and return to Yahweh (Hos. 5:15), a notion for which later Dtn authors provide a more systematic description (Dt. 4:30).[14]

In the hiphil the verb refers almost exclusively to the distress prompted by an enemy (Dt. 28:52; 1 K. 8:37; 2 Ch. 6:28; 28:20,22; 33:12; Jer. 10:18; Zeph. 1:17).

2. *ṣar I.* According to Nu. 22:26, the angel of Yahweh stood *b^emāqôm ṣar,* "in a narrow place," so that Balaam was unable to pass through *('ên-dereḵ).* The company of prophets complains to Elisha that the place where they live under his charge is too small for them (*ṣar min,* 2 K. 6:1); they go to the Jordan to gather wood to build a larger place. A salvific oracle tells childless Zion that soon there will not be enough space for the many children to come (*ṣar l^e,* Isa. 49:20).

After these originally spatial references, *ṣar* then also comes to describe a mood or disposition. When Eli's sons, Hophni and Phinehas, engage in reprehensible behavior, a man of God threatens Eli, telling him that he will one day look *ṣar mā'ôn* (read *ṣar m^e'ōyēn*[15]), "with great distress" (NRSV "with greedy eye"), upon the prosperity God bestows on Israel, whereas his own family will be punished (1 S. 2:32). In his first counter to Eliphaz, Job is already courageous enough to address his complaint to God himself. In the anguish of his spirit (*b^eṣar rûaḥ* par. *b^emar nepeš*), he intends to dispute God (Job 7:11). Eliphaz, however, classifies Job among the wicked whom *ṣar* and *māṣôq* seize and terrify (*b't,* 15:24). Elihu tries to explain to him that God leads the afflicted out of their distress *(ṣar)* on his own initiative and into a "broad place" (*raḥaḇ,* 36:16). By contrast, Job's cry will not lead him out of that distress (v. 19).

In his present request for help, the petitioner in Ps. 4 can already gratefully ac-

14. See D. Knapp, *Deuteronomium 4: Literarische Analyse und theologische Interpretation. GTA* 35 (1987), 161.

15. *HAL,* II, 610b, 817b ("envious, jealous; resentful").

knowledge how God gave him "room" in his "straits" (v. 2[1]). In Ps. 32 as well, the petitioner rejoices in his forgiveness with the words *'attâ sēṯer lî miṣṣar tiṣṣ^erēnî,* "you are a hiding place for me, you preserve me from trouble" (par. → פלט *pillēṭ,* v. 7). According to Ps. 119:143, it is Yahweh's commandments that make the person afflicted by *ṣar* and *māṣôq* rejoice again. In the tradition of the book of Isaiah, Yahweh is extolled as the savior *(môšîa')* who delivers his people from their distress (Isa. 63:8-9).

One series of occurrences uses the term to express apocalyptic features. Isa. 5:30 announces the Assyrian onslaught with its accompanying "roaring of the sea," "dark clouds," and *ḥōšeḵ ṣar,* "oppressive (fearful) darkness." While the people eat only *leḥem ṣar,* "bread of adversity," and the "water of affliction" under God's tutelage,[16] Isa. 30:20 announces deliverance with cosmic apocalyptic features (cf. vv. 25b-26, addendum?). The first divine discourse in the book of Job also uses apocalyptic imagery. According to Job 38:23, God has reserved snow and hail for the "time of trouble" (*'eṯ-ṣar* par. *yôm q^erāḇ* par. *milḥāmâ*). In a hymn to God's righteousness within the extremely late Isaiah apocalypse, which ends in a prediction of resurrection (Isa. 26:19), the author compares his own distress *(ṣar)* and torment (read *ṣāqôn*) with the travails of a pregnant woman (vv. 16-17; cf. Jer. 48:41; 49:22; 1QH 3:9; 5:29). All these passages presuppose that the term's meaning is already familiar. All involve situations of being in unpleasant "straits," a sense of having no saving access to "expanse," of stricture necessarily implying anxiety and oppressiveness prompted by a hopeless situation.

Postexilic proverbial wisdom is quite reserved in its use of this term. A section of fatherly advice (Prov. 23:12-35) must, of course, include a warning to the son against the adulterous woman. The wisdom teacher explains his admonition by pointing out that such a woman is a *šûḥâ '^amuqqâ,* a "deep pit," and that the strange woman is a *b^e'ēr ṣārâ,* a "narrow well" (v. 27); she robs him who falls prey to her of any expansiveness in life, of all of life's possibilities, and keeps him in a condition of anxious stricture.

Among the acrostically structured advice in Prov. 24:1-22, v. 10 resists interpretation, reading *hiṯrappîṯā b^eyôm ṣārâ ṣar kōḥeḵā,* approximately "if you prove lax in the day of distress, your strength is also distressed." The LXX's one-time rendering of *ṣar* by the verb *ekleípein,* "leave, abandon," shows that the MT is corrupt (cf. the extensive attempts at emendation in *BHS*).

3. *ṣārâ I.* Only a few occurrences of *ṣārâ* I date reliably to the preexilic period. The hymn to Zion Ps. 46 is probably the earliest occurrence, preserving from the early monarchy the ancient confession, "Yahweh is our refuge and shelter, a well-proved help *b^eṣārôṯ*" (v. 2[1]). The significant feature here is the broad meaning "distress, trouble," i.e., all that is "not ideal." Even early proverbial wisdom, influenced by Amenemope, knows that such distress demands considerable wisdom and understanding on the part of those affected if they are not to become completely exhausted (Prov.

---

16. A different view is taken by H. Wildberger, *Jesaja 28–39. BK* X/3 (1982), 1190-91, who reads *miṣṣar/millaḥaṣ,* "bread without adversity, water without affliction," and understands the verse as a promise (see 1196-97).

24:10). Instruction for officials dating to the early monarchy asserts that only the true friend proves to be kin in times of distress (17:17), that only the righteous are "delivered from trouble" (11:8; 12:13) along with those who "watch over mouth and tongue" (21:23). One old and quite catchy proverb asserts that "like a bad tooth or a lame foot is trust in a faithless person in time of trouble" (25:19).

During the period immediately preceding the exile, *ṣārâ* acquires more pronounced theological contours. In view of the political confusion of the Assyrian onslaught, the people's panic-stricken anxiety is compared to the travails of a woman giving birth (Jer. 6:24). The prophets, possibly drawing from the realization of earlier theological wisdom that God's help is closest when distress is greatest (cf. Job 5:19), clearly try to enjoin the people to cry out to Yahweh as their "savior in time of trouble" (*môšîaʿ bᵉʿēṯ ṣārâ,* Jer. 14:8; 16:19; Nah. 1:7) that he might bring an end to their distress (Nah. 1:9). The theologoumenon of the "day of Yahweh"[17] incorporates a portrayal of the time of distress (Jer. 30:7) with its cries of fear recalling those of a woman giving birth for the first time (4:31 cj.[18]). The prophets are also able to reformulate this notion into a salvific announcement for Judah by shifting these motifs to the enemies; now it is Damascus (49:24) and Babylon (50:43) who tremble in their distress like a woman giving birth. Zeph. 1:15 develops these portrayals of anxiety within a cosmological-apocalyptic horizon. This day is a day of "wrath" *(ʿeḇrâ),* of "distress" *(ṣārâ),* of "anguish" *(mᵉṣûqâ),* of "ruin" *(šōʾâ)* and "devastation" *(mᵉšōʾâ),* of "darkness" *(ḥōšeḵ)* and "gloom" *(ʾᵃpēlâ),* of "clouds" *(ʿānān)* and "thick darkness" *(ʿᵃrāpel),* of the ram's horn *(šôpār)* and the "battle cry" *(tᵉrûʿâ).*

The majority of passages date to the exilic period and later. The attempt to come to terms with the historical catastrophe becomes urgent in Dtr statements such as: "In that day they will say, 'Have not these troubles come upon us because our God is not in our midst?'" (Dt. 31:17). V. 21, anticipating the Song of Moses, responds that a breach of the covenant necessarily results in terrible troubles, something the following song will attest. A breach of the covenant and a turning to other gods are thus a fundamental cause of such troubles (Jgs. 10:14; Isa. 8:22; 46:7).

The classic apostasy-repentance schema within the Dtr History uses the term *ṣārâ* to describe the distress brought by the enemy after apostasy from Yahweh only in Jgs. 10:14, as does the Chronicler's History in Neh. 9:27 (note the wordplay), even though *ṣārâ* otherwise quite often does refer to such distress (2 K. 19:3; Ps. 25:22; 54:9[7]; 78:49; Isa. 37:3; Jer. 6:24; 14:8; Ob. 12,14; Nah. 1:7,9). It is replaced here by the verb *ṣārar* (Jgs. 2:15; 10:9; 11:7; 1 S. 13:6; cf. also 1 S. 28:15; 2 S. 24:14; 2 Ch. 15:4).

Several passages emphatically identify Yahweh as the God who delivers those from distress who call on him (Gen. 35:3); the Davidic dynasty seems to have received particular assurances in this regard (cf. 2 S. 22:7; 2 Ch. 20:9; cf. also 1 S. 26:24; 2 S. 4:9; 1 K. 1:29; Ps. 18:7[6]; 20:2[1]) in connection with the presence of Yahweh's name (cf.

---

17. → יוֹם *yôm,* VI, 7-32.

18. Cj. with W. Rudolph, *Jeremia. HAT* I/12 (³1968), 36.

protection for his beloved. "The woman is protected by his sure and intimate solidarity with her. He endows her with vitality and distinction."[21]

Job 14:17 is similarly disputed. Job knows God is always watching him. "My transgression would be sealed up in a bag, and you would cover over (?) my iniquity." The semantically ambiguous *ṭpl* (v. 17b) makes it difficult to interpret the parallel colon. Some interpreters think it refers to a definitive elimination of sin, i.e., to forgiveness.[22] Others think it refers to a temporary storing up of sin to be used later as evidence.[23] Given the complex nature of the passage, however, probably no definitive interpretation is possible. The terms "seal up" *(ḥtm)* and *ṣrr* (cf. esp. Isa. 8:16) allow both possibilities. There is some question whether v. 17 belongs to v. 16 as an announcement of a salvific future. Similarly, the meaning of *ṭpl* is unclear, and the frequent comparison with the "bundling" of Ephraim's sin in Hos. 13:12 (see above) is questionable.

In 1 S. 25:29 Abigail expresses the hope that David's life will be "bound *(ṣᵉrûrâ)* in the *ṣᵉrôr haḥayyîm* under the care of Yahweh"; and in 1QH 2:20 the collective community praises God, "for you have placed my soul in the *ṣᵉrôr haḥayyîm*." The parallel colons confirm that both passages understand this expression as a reference to protection or shelter. The bag (the notion of the moneybag is evoked) is a possession to which the owner must be particularly attentive; cf. the Old Babylonian wish that "your lord and mistress protect you as they do the bag in their hands" *(kima kīsi ša qātišunu liṣṣurūki)*.[24] Sir. 6:15 advises that "faithful friends are a bag of life *(ṣrwr ḥyyim, phármakon zōḗs)*, no amount can balance their worth," suggesting that the expression refers to more than merely the bag itself. Other theological implications emerge from the similar expression "book of life,"[25] which anticipates how human existence will be taken up and sheltered at a higher level of divine protection, a salvific state with no temporal restrictions. Eissfeldt refers to Nuzi, where the numbering of livestock by means of stones in a bag showed how many were present. This reference makes the translation "bundle of the living" (with Vulg. contra LXX *desmós tḗs zōḗs*) probable and also discourages any association with a magical or mantic background.[26] Beyond the reference to protection, however, the expression also makes a statement about possession implying more than mere protection.

The two terms *mēṣar* and *māṣôr* are hardly distinguishable from *ṣārâ* I. The former *(mēṣar)* refers to the distress of imprisonment (Lam. 1:3) where Judah finds no resting place, and to the distress of the psalmist in the face of unjust persecution and mortal danger (Ps. 116:3) from which only God can provide deliverance (118:5). The latter *(māṣôr)* refers primarily to the distress associated with military siege (Dt. 28:53,55,57; Jer. 10:17; 19:9). The psalmist views this *māṣôr* as a distressful human condition that is

---

21. O. Keel, *Song of Songs* (Eng. trans. 1994), 64-67, quotation on 66.
22. A. Weiser, *Das Buch Hiob. ATD* 13 (1951, [7]1980), in loc.
23. G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), in loc.
24. See *AHw*, I, 487.
25. → סֵפֶר *sēper*, X, 326-41.
26. See A. Marmorstein, "I Sam 25,29," *ZAW* 43 (1925) 119-24.

also an appropriate occasion for divine deliverance or revelation; hence one should indeed pray to God (Ps. 32:6) and praise him (31:22[21]; 66:11).

IV. 1. *LXX.* The term *ṣārar* I apparently constituted a kind of crux for the LXX, which renders it 21 times as *thlíbein ktl.* and then only with isolated terms. By contrast, the LXX had no problems with *ṣar* aside from the textually uncertain passages (see above). It translates the adjective with *stenós,* "narrow," and *sklērós,* "dry," with the exception of Prov. 24:10, where it uses *ekleípein* (see above). It translates the substantive as *thlípsis* (4 times), *anánkē* (3 times), *stenós* (once), or personalizes it to *ṣar* II and translates as *echthrós* (twice) or *diábolos* (Est. 7:4). It probably had a different text in 1 S. 2:32.

The LXX translates *ṣārâ* I as *thlípsis* (62 times), *kakós* (5 times), and *anánkē* (4 times). It translates *ṣ*[e]*rôr* as *desmós* (4 times), *apódesmos,* and *balántion* (once each). It translates *mēṣar* twice as *thlípsis* and once as *kíndynos,* whereas *māṣôr* apparently caused it considerable difficulties.

2. *Qumran.* The verb *ṣārar* occurs 7 times in Qumran (and 3 additional times in as yet unpublished texts) and refers to the distress of the community in its attempts to withstand all temptations and afflictions (cf. 1QSb 5:23; 1QpHab 5:6). By contrast, *ṣar* I has not yet been reliably documented in the Qumran texts. One might possibly translate 4Q381 24:5, *g'l lyhwdh mkl ṣr* with E. M. Schuller to the effect: "he delivered Judah from all distress."[27] 4Q380 2:4 corresponds to Ps. 107:6, while 4Q178 1:2 is uncertain.

The term *ṣārâ* I occurs 24 times (additionally about 20 times in as yet unpublished texts from 2Q-10Q). The Essenes seem to have used the word even in the pre-Qumranite period (cf. 1QS 8:4), and it also occurs in the oldest parts of 1QM, then 6 times in 1QS, 3 times in 1QH and in 4QDibHam[a], twice in 1QM, twice in 4QM[f], and once in 4QM[a].

The draft constitution of the Essene community already stipulates that its members are to practice righteousness, justice, loving-kindness, and humility and to atone for sin so that they might bear "the sorrows of affliction" (1QS 8:4). The Qumran Essenes understood themselves as living in "seasons of distress" (*mô'*[a]*ḏê ṣārâ,* 3:23; cf. CD 4:5; 4QShir[b]) and in an "abode of distress" (*m*[e]*ḵôn ṣārâ,* 1QS 10:15) and accordingly were preparing for the decisive confrontation (1QM 1:12; 15:1). The age was characterized by blow upon blow and *ṣārâ* upon *ṣārâ* (3Q5 1:3). In the great confession of faith (4QDibHam[a] [504] frs. 1-2, I 8–VII 2), the believer asserts that although "we have entered into distress, have been stricken and tried by the fury of the oppressor" (V 17), "our soul has not despised your trials and scourges to the point of breaking your covenant despite all the distress of our soul" (VI 8). The confession concludes with praise of God, "who delivers us from all distress. Amen! Amen!" (VII 2).

The *Hodayot* emphasize more the anthropologically focused meaning of *ṣārâ.* The

27. E. M. Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms from Qumran. HSS* 28 (1986), 115.

psalmists know that God has not forsaken them "in the soul's distress" (1QH 5:12). Quite the contrary, God provides their "straitened souls" with "everlasting space" (9:28), "resolving their distress" (1QS 11:13), and enlarging their souls to "eternal salvation and perpetual and unfailing peace" (1QH 15:16). Hence they praise God even in the midst of distress (1QS 10:17).

The use of *ṣᵉrôr* in 1QH 2:20 (see above) is of significance, while its occurrence in the previously unpublished text 4QSl 56 contributes nothing to further interpretation because of the corrupt condition of the text itself.

The term *mēṣar* occurs only in 1QH 5:29, where it compares the anguish into which Belial's intrigues have led with the travails of a woman giving birth.

Fabry

צַר II *ṣar* II; צֹרֵר *ṣōrēr;* צרר *ṣrr* II

Contents: I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences; 3. Word Field. II. OT Use: 1. *ṣar;* 2. *ṣōrēr;* 3. *ṣārâ,* Enmity? 4. The Verb *ṣrr.* III. 1. LXX; 2. Qumran.

I. 1. *Etymology.* The Heb. terms *ṣar* and *ṣōrēr,* "enemy," derive from the root *ṣrr* II, comparable to Ugar. *ṣrt,* "hostility, enmity," Akk. *ṣerru* III, "hostility, enmity," Christian Palestinian Aram. *ʿr,* "indignation, opposition" (also verb), Arab. *ḍarr, ḍurr,* "damage," Eth. *ḍar,* "enemy" (also the verb *ḍarara*), OSA *ḍr,* "war, enemy."[1]

2. *Occurrences.* Distinguishing between this term and *ṣrr* I, "be narrow," with *ṣar* and *ṣārâ,* "affliction, distress," is sometimes difficult, and the number of occurrences is accordingly uncertain. Lisowsky adduces 70 occurrences of *ṣar,* 17 for *ṣōrēr,* while *HAL* lists 3 occurrences of *ṣārâ* with the meaning "enmity" (abstract for concrete, meaning "enemy," Ps. 54:9[Eng. 7]; 138:7; 143:11, all with *ʾōyēḇ* in the same context).[2] Uncertain texts include Isa. 9:10(11); Jer. 48:5; Ezk. 30:16; cj. Ps. 89:43(42).

The term occurs almost exclusively in poetic texts or in any case within elevated language and rarely in purely prose texts, though cf. Nu. 10:9 in the law concerning the silver trumpets (a later author added "when an adversary attacks you [*ṣrr*]") and Josh. 5:13 (Joshua asks the captain of Yahweh's army, "are you one of us, or one of our enemies?"); also 2 S. 24:13 par. 1 Ch. 21:12; Ezr. 4:1; Neh. 4:5(11); Est. 7:6.

ṣar II. G. R. Castellino, "Lᵉmaʿan ṣôrᵉrêkā (Salmo 8,3)," *De la Tôrah au Messie. FS H. Cazelles* (Paris, 1981), 293-98; E. Jenni, "צרר *ṣrr* to show hostility toward," *TLOT,* III, 1098-99; → איב *ʾāyaḇ* (*ʾāyabh*), I, 212-18.

1. In order: *WUS,* no. 2353; *AHw,* III, 1093; Beeston, 42.
2. Lisowsky, s.v.; *HAL,* III, 1054b; see II.3 below.

be understood as "distresses, afflictions"? V. 28 uses *'ōyēḇ* similarly). In the coming period of salvation, however, the enemies *(ṣārîm)* who devour, plunder, and prey on Israel will themselves go into captivity (Jer. 30:16).

The term *ṣar* refers less frequently to enemies of the individual. Even when Melchizedek says to Abraham, "El Elyon has delivered your enemies into your hand" (Gen. 14:20), the reference is still to a large military undertaking. And although 2 S. 24:13 par. 1 Ch. 21:12 do speak about David's enemies, they do so in what is actually an official context, namely, with reference to David as king. Ps. 89:24(23) also speaks about David's enemies, but in so doing clearly focuses on David as the founder of the dynasty. God "crushes his foes before him and strikes down those who hate him *(mᵉśanē')*." V. 43(42) similarly refers to the enemies of the anointed king (par. *'ôyēḇ)*.

The exact kind of enemy or adversary is difficult to determine in psalms that speak about the enemies of an individual petitioner.[4] Ps. 3:2(1) says only that they are numerous (par. *qāmîm*), and in v. 8(7) calls them *'ōyᵉḇîm* and *rᵉšā'îm*. Ps. 13 speaks about the sorrow *(yāgôn)* and spiritual struggles *('ēṣôṯ!)* caused by the enemy (*'ōyēḇ*, v. 3[2]) and recounts the victory over the *ṣārîm* (v. 5[4]). Yet just what constitutes the petitioner's sufferings remains unclear. Ps. 27:2 equates *mᵉrē'îm, ṣārîm,* and *'ōyᵉḇîm,* and in v. 12 identifies the *ṣārîm* as false witnesses. Ps. 112 alludes to slander in v. 7, promises victory over the *ṣārîm* in v. 8, and mentions *rᵉšā'îm* in v. 10. According to Ps. 119:139, the *ṣārîm* forget God's word, and according to v. 157 the persecutors and *ṣārîm* are numerous. Job 6:23 uses *ṣar* parallel with *'ārîṣîm* and seems to allude to external violence (cf. Jer. 15:21 with *rā'îm*). Job laments in 16:9 that his adversary "sharpens his eyes against me," a singular expression comparing a person's eyes with a sharpened sword.

Enemies of God's people are by extension also enemies of God. A slightly varied expression perhaps originally deriving from a cultic formula offers the assurance that God will indeed take revenge on these enemies (Dt. 32:41, par. *mᵉśannē'*; cf. v. 43; Jer. 46:10; par. *'ōyēḇ:* Isa. 1:24; 59:18; Nah. 1:2).

In the hymn to God's righteousness within what is known as the Isaiah apocalypse (Isa. 26:7-19), the poet says that fire will consume God's *ṣārîm* (v. 11). The prophet asks God in 64:1(2) to "make your name known to your adversaries so that the nations might tremble at your presence." According to Ps. 97:3, a consuming fire devours the enemies at God's theophany. According to Job 19:11, God treats Job himself like his *ṣārîm.*

2. *ṣōrēr.* The occurrences of *ṣōrēr* resemble those of *ṣar.* The word often refers to political or military enemies. The (Dtr?) addendum to the Covenant Code asserts among other things that "if you . . . do all that I say, then I will be an enemy to your enemies *('yb)* and a foe to your foes *(ṣartî 'eṯ-ṣōrᵉrêḵā)*" (Ex. 23:22). The late verse Isa. 11:13 promises that the hostility between Ephraim and Judah will end. "The jealousy *(qin'â)* of Ephraim shall depart, the enemies [*ṣōrēr,* NRSV 'hostility'] of Judah shall be cut off, Ephraim shall not be jealous *(qn')* of Judah, and Judah shall not be hostile *(ṣrr)*

4. Ibid., 218.

I. Etymology.

1. *Substantive.* The term *ṣāra'aṯ* is an abstract construction of the *qaṭṭal* type[1] belonging to a group of analogously constructed medical terms, including *baheret* (Lev. 13:2), *sappaḥaṯ* (13:2), *yallepeṯ* (21:20; 22:22), *yabbeleṯ* (22:22), *gārāḇ* (21:20; 22:22; Dt. 28:27), *qāraḥaṯ, gabbaḥaṯ* (Lev. 13:42), among which the root occasionally alludes to one of the more obvious symptoms of the illness, e.g., *bhr,* "shine," *spḥ,* "be thin." The term *ṣāra'aṯ,* however, derives from a root whose meaning is unknown.[2]

2. *Hebrew Derivation.* The customary derivation of *ṣāra'aṯ* suggested by earlier lexicons[3] was influenced by the verbal derivation of the substantive of *ṣr'* and the presumed etymological connection with Arab. *ṣara'a,* "cast down, throw to the ground" / *ḍara'a,* "be humble, submissive,"[4] OSA *ḍr'*.[5] The term *ḍr'* also occurs as a Semitic loanword in an Egyptian text from Medinet Habu in the time of Ramses III in reference to those who have been vanquished or slain.[6] Hence the term *ṣāra'aṯ* came to be understood as meaning "despondency, dejection," or "disfiguring, humiliating illness,"[7] or as a "stroke" with which God strikes the sinner.[8]

Sawyer objects to this verbal derivation for the following reasons.[9] (1) Understood as "despondency, dejection," "blow," *ṣāra'aṯ* does not fit the series of analogous medical abstractions[10] alluding to a specific symptom. (2) The frequent expression *nega' ṣāra'aṯ* (an "onslaught" of *ṣāra'aṯ*) suggests that rather than representing a tautology, this expression in fact differentiates between the two terms. (3) Rather than referring to

---

(1966) 47-58; idem, "Medicine in the Land and the Times of the OT," in T. Ishida, ed., *Studies in the Period of David and Solomon and Other Essays* (Winona Lake, Ind., 1982), 337-65; W. Klein, "Dermatologie im AT" (diss., Tübingen, 1949); L. Köhler, *Hebrew Man* (Eng. trans. 1956); idem, "Aussatz," *ZAW* 67 (1955) 290-91; E. A. Nida, "The Translation of 'Leprosy,'" *BT* 11 (1960) 80-81; J. Preuss, *Biblical and Talmudic Medicine* (Eng. trans. 1978); J. F. A. Sawyer, "A Note on the Etymology of *ṣāra'aṯ,*" *VT* 26 (1976) 241-45; T. Seidl, *Tora für den "Aussatz"-Fall: Literarische Schichten und syntaktische Strukturen in Lev. 13 und 14. ATS* 18 (1982); K. Seybold and U. Müller, *Sickness and Healing* (Eng. trans. 1981); H. J. Stipp, *Elischa, Propheten, Gottesmänner. ATS* 24 (1987); J. L. Swellengrebel, "'Leprosy' and the Bible: The Translation of 'Tsara'ath' and 'Lepra,'" *BT* 11 (1960) 69-80; P. G. Unna, "Ein typischer Fall von Papierwissenschaft," *Das monistische Jahrhundert* 16-18 (1912) 527-33, 559-66, 592-602; D. H. Wallington, "'Leprosy' and the Bible: Conclusion," *BT* 12 (1961) 75-79; J. Wilkinson, "Leprosy and Leviticus: The Problem of Description and Identification," *SJT* 30 (1977) 153-69; idem, "Leprosy and Leviticus: A Problem of Semantics and Translation," *SJT* 31 (1978) 153-66.

1. See *BLe,* §61xβ-zβ; *VG,* I, §150; *NSS,* §93a.
2. Sawyer, 243.
3. *GesB,* 695-96; *BDB,* 863; *KBL*², 816-17.
4. Lane, I/4, 1678ff.; I/5, 1787ff.
5. Beeston, 41-42.
6. Personal communication from M. Görg; see H. W. Helck, *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr. ÄgAbh* 5 (²1971), 527, no. 314; *ANET,* 262-63.
7. Cf., e.g., G. R. Driver, et al., "Leprosy," *HDB* (sn21963), 575.
8. Köhler, *Hebrew Man,* 48.
9. Sawyer, 242ff.
10. See I.1 above.

prompt him to reject these derivations. Kinnier Wilson has collected together Akkadian texts possibly involving skin diseases, though without any terminological parallels.[19] In Ethiopic the presumed sound shift *r-l-n*[20] allows for an etymological correspondence between *ṣāra'aṯ* on the one hand and *ṣĕrnĕ'ĕt*, "porrigo, impetigo pruriens," and *ṣal'ē/ṣel'ē*, "vulnus, ulcus," on the other.[21]

II. Occurrences and Meaning.

1. *Overview.* The subst. *ṣāra'aṯ* occurs 35 times in the OT, including 29 in Lev. 13–14, the torah concerning "skin disease" (13:2,3,8,9,11,12[bis],13,15,20,25[bis],27,30, 42,43,47,49,51,52,59; 14:3,7,32,34,44,54,55,57). The remaining occurrences are Dt. 24:8 (law); 2 K. 5:3,6,7,27 (Naaman); and 2 Ch. 26:19 (Uzziah). The presumably denominated verb *ṣr'* occurs 5 times in the qal passive participle (Lev. 13:44,45; 14:3; 22:4; Nu. 5:2) and 15 in the pual participle *(meṣōrā')*, though only once in Leviticus (14:2). The remaining occurrences are Ex. 4:6 (Aaron); Nu. 12:10 (Miriam); 2 S. 3:29 (Joab); 2 K. 5:1,11,27 (Naaman); 2 K. 7:3 (four persons with skin diseases), 8; 2 K. 15:5 (Azariah/Uzziah); 2 Ch. 26:20,21,23 (Azariah). The two participial forms generally function as adjectives and substantive participles (concrete and individual), then also once as a substitute for an abstract substantive (as the obj. of *'āsap*, 2 K. 5:11).

2. *Syntactial Considerations.* In the torah concerning "skin disease" in Leviticus,[22] *ṣāra'aṯ* occurs 11 times (Lev. 13:2,3,9,20,47,49,59; 14:3,32,34,54) as the *nomen rectum* in a construct expression with *nega'*, "blow, touch," "attack." Because *nega'* refers to an "onset of illness in a general sense,"[23] and can appear with other substantives as well (e.g., *neṯeq* [13:31]), one cannot rashly equate *ṣāra'aṯ* and *nega'* as synonyms.[24] In this expression with *ṣāra'aṯ, nega'* refers to contact with a sphere far removed from Yahweh (act.) or to the onset of an illness caused by a demon (pass.; 14:34, caused by Yahweh).[25]

Syntactically the expression *nega' ṣāra'aṯ* generally constitutes the predicate of a nominal clause of classification (i.e., with the subj. *hû', hî'*) and in the cases and subcases of the skin-disease torah often functions as a statement concluding the case under discussion (13:3,9,20,49) or as a summarizing signature (13:59; 14:32,54). The expression *nega' ṣāra'aṯ* can also, however, appear in conditional clauses at the beginnings of case discussions (13:2,9,47; 14:34) or in other parts of case explications (14:3).[26] The absolute use of *ṣāra'aṯ* in Lev. 13–14 also demonstrates the technical function of the lexeme as a genre reference; it functions as a diagnosis without any sub-

19. Kinnier Wilson, *RA* 60 (1966) 47-48.
20. Leslau, *Contributions*, 5.
21. See, respectively, *LexLingAeth*, 1275, 1262; see also Leslau, *Contributions*, 46.
22. On the unity and structure of this overall corpus see Seidl, 25ff., 73ff.
23. *HAL*, II, 669a.
24. As does K. Elliger, *Leviticus*. *HAT* IV (1966), 180; justified critique from Sawyer, 242.
25. See Elliger, *Leviticus*, 180.
26. The text of Lev. 13:22, with *nega'* alone as a diagnosis, is uncertain; see Seidl, 9 n. 44.

stantival or adjectival qualification in 13:8,15,25,27. In this function the substantive is usually qualified by various other substantives or adjectival elements, e.g., in 13:30 with *ṣāraʿaṯ hārōʾš ʾô hazzāqān,* which specifies the location of the attack (cf. 13:42). Lev. 13:11 *(nôšeneṯ),* 42 *(pōraḥaṯ),* 51,52; and 14:44 *(mamʾereṯ)* use adjectival participles to specify certain features of *ṣāraʿaṯ,* albeit features whose medical background can no longer be determined (e.g., 11, "chronic"; 42, "blooming, i.e., breaking out"; 51, "opening up").[27] Prepositional phrases are occasionally used to indicate the affected area (on the body or clothes; 13:11,42; 14:44).

Compared to this substantive use as a diagnosis, summary, and exposition in cases in Lev. 13–14, verbal expressions with *ṣāraʿaṯ* occur only rarely. In 13:12-13 the process *prḥ* or the activity *ksh* piel is predicated of *ṣāraʿaṯ* as the subject, both times with reference to the skin of the human body. In 3 instances *negaʿ ṣāraʿaṯ* is associated with *hāyâ,* in 13:9 as the subject of an incipient illness affecting people, and in 13:2 as the prepositional object indicating the goal of such an illness. In the case described, the symptoms on the person's skin, *śᵉʾēṯ, sappaḥaṯ, bahereṯ,*[28] lead to *negaʿ ṣāraʿaṯ* on the person's body. Lev. 13:47 addresses the emergence of *negaʿ ṣāraʿaṯ* on clothes.[29] According to 14:34, Yahweh causes *negaʿ ṣāraʿaṯ* to befall houses,[30] expressed by *nāṯan* with a direct object. Lev. 14:3 and 14:7 use passive constructions to express the healing (*rpʾ* niphal) or the cleansing (*ṭhr* hithpael) of *ṣāraʿaṯ.*

Regarding the use of *ṣāraʿaṯ* in the torah concerning "skin disease" in Lev. 13–14, one can say that substantive clauses predominate in which *ṣāraʿaṯ* functions as a technical term for describing and diagnosing an otherwise unspecified skin disease that makes a person cultically impure[31] or a similar phenomenon on clothes and houses, or as a catchword used in super- or subscriptions attaching to such passages. In the less frequent verbal expressions, *ṣāraʿaṯ* is associated with developments and alterations in the progress of an illness or attack.

Among the 6 remaining passages outside Lev. 13–14, only Dt. 24:8 occurs in a legal context. It contains a general warning in the form of an imperative *(šmr* hithpael) against *negaʿ ṣāraʿaṯ,* expanded by the addition of two infinitive clauses with a reference to the priestly torah concerning "skin disease" (pl. form of address)[32] and a vague reminiscence of the Miriam episode in Nu. 12:9ff. (Dt. 24:9).

Several verses from the Naaman story (2 K. 5:3,6,7) use the expression *ʾāsap (naʿᵃmān) miṣṣāraʿtô* in discourse and address the possible healing of Naaman's case of "skin disease" in Samaria.[33]

Elisha's curse of Gehazi and his house in 2 K. 5:27 *(wᵉṣāraʿaṯ naʿᵃmān tiḏbaq-bᵉḵā)*

---

27. So Elliger's interpretation, *Leviticus,* 160-61.

28. Concerning the interpretation see Preuss, 374ff.; Hulse, 98; Wilkinson, *SJT* 30 (1977) 157-58.

29. Cf. in general D. Hoffmann, *Das Buch Leviticus,* I (Berlin, 1905), 388-89; Hulse, 94.

30. Bibliography in Seidl, 59.

31. → טמא *ṭāmēʾ,* V, 330-42.

32. G. von Rad, *Deuteronomy. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1966), 151.

33. See Stipp, 300ff.

anomalies requiring priestly diagnosis and purity assessment (*ṭm'* piel) and involving quarantine (*sgr* hiphil; 2×7 days). Priestly involvement is again required for lifting the quarantine and effecting cultic reintegration (*ṭhr* piel, "declare pure"), the latter procedure being ritually expanded in Lev. 14:2ff. The assessment of *ṣāra'aṯ* on clothes and houses represents analogical and metaphorical transference whose specifics remain unclarified.[40]

The discussion attaching to Gramberg's essay is instructive regarding the special problem accompanying the usual English translations of *ṣāra'aṯ* as "leprosy" that thereby foster the problematic identification of *ṣāra'aṯ* as modern *lépra*.[41] Gramberg's suggestion that one avoid the word "leprosy" in English Bible translations prompted the New English Bible, e.g., to render *ṣāra'aṯ* as "skin disease."[42] The World Health Organization has similarly supported such usage in order to put an end to the inhuman consequences for those affected by leprosy.[43] In German-speaking scholarship, Köhler suggested as early as 1955 that one avoid the term *Aussatz* as a translation of *ṣāra'aṯ* and use *Hautkrankheit*, "skin disease," instead.[44]

By way of summary, one might also list the synonyms for *ṣāra'aṯ* used in Lev. 13 to differentiate various diagnoses or other variations of *ṣāra'aṯ* or that appear outside the torah concerning "skin diseases" in reference to skin anomalies. Lev. 13:6 (cf. v. 2), *mispaḥaṯ* (LXX *sēmasía*, "impetigo" [so Elliger]); v. 23 (cf. v. 18), *ṣārebeṯ haššᵉḥîn* (LXX *oulḗ toú hélkous*, "scar of the ulcer"); v. 28, *śᵉ'ēṯ hammikwâ* (LXX *oulḗ toú katakaúmatos*, "boil of the burn wound"); v. 30, *neṯeq* (LXX *thraúsma*, "eczema" on the hair of the head or beard); v. 39, *bōhaq* (LXX *alphós*, "vitiligo, skin disease").[45]

Passages outside Lev. 13–14 include Ex. 9:9-11; Dt. 28:27,35; 2 K. 20:7; Job 2:7; Isa. 38:21, *šᵉḥîn* (LXX *hélkos, hélkē*, "ulcer"); Lev. 21:20; 22:22, *yallepeṯ* (LXX *lichḗ*, "eczema"); Dt. 28:27, *ḥeres* (LXX *knḗphē*, "scabies"); Lev. 22:22, *yabbeleṯ* (LXX *myrmēkiṓn*, "wart"); Lev. 21:20; 22:22; Dt. 28:27, *gārāḇ* (LXX *psōragriṓn, psṓra agría*, "scabies").

4. *Qumran*. The Qumran Temple Scroll involves both the word field and the overall theme of *ṣāra'aṯ*, with occurrences limited to OT constructions (11QT 45:17; 46:18; 48:15,17; 49:4). 11QT 45:17,18 mention persons forbidden from entering the city of the sanctuary, including *kl ṣrw' wmnwg'*, where *ṣrw'* corresponds to Nu. 5:2, while *mnwg'*, though based on biblical *ng' ṣr't*, occurs only in extrabiblical witnesses (1QS 2:10-11; 1QM 7:4) and in the Mishnah (cf., e.g., *Neg.* 13:6).[46] 11QT 46:16-18 calls for the estab-

---

40. See in this regard Seidl, 42 n. 261, 59 n. 333.

41. See esp. Nida, Wallington, Swellengrebel, Cochrane.

42. Concerning variations and critique, see Hulse, 101ff., 104; the NRSV generally provides a footnote reference to its use of "leprosy, leprous," explaining that the term refers to "several skin diseases; precise meaning uncertain."

43. Seybold and Müller, 69; Sawyer, 245 n. 17.

44. Köhler, *ZAW* 67 (1955) 290.

45. Concerning these terms see Elliger, *Leviticus*, 180ff.; bibliog. in Seidl, 5ff.

46. See Y. Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, I-IIIA (Jerusalem, 1977), I, 293-94; II, 194.

lishment of three separate locales east of the city of the sanctuary for, among others, *hmṣwr'ym whzbym* (see Nu. 5:2).[47] 11QT 48:14-16 stipulates that all cities establish places of quarantine for *mnwg'ym bṣr't wbng' wbntq . . . lzbym wlnšym.* In the related but fragmentary passages 48:17 and 49:4, one discerns the OT expressions *ṣr't nwšnt* (Lev. 13:11), *ntq* (Lev. 13:30), and *ng' ṣr't.* Yadin suggests that the missing ll. 1-3 contained instructions regarding cleansing rituals for *ṣr't* corresponding to Lev. 14.[48]

Seidl

47. Ibid., I, 305-6.
48. Ibid., II, 211.

צָרַף *ṣārap;* מַצְרֵף *maṣrēp;* צֹרְפִי *ṣōr^e pî*

Contents: I. Root and Distribution. II. 1. OT Forms and Occurrences; 2. Parallels and Expressions. III. General Use: 1. The Verb *ṣārap;* 2. The Nouns *maṣrēp* and *ṣōr^e pî.* IV. Theological Considerations. V. Qumran and LXX.

I. Root and Distribution. The root *ṣrp* is attested throughout the Semitic sphere;[1] examples include Akk. *ṣarāpu* I, "refine, burn, dye (fiery) red";[2] the verbal adj. *ṣarpu,* "refined, burned, reddened," said of (pure) silver as well as of clay,[3] and *ṣurrupu/ ṣarrupum,* "refined," said of silver;[4] OSA *ṣrp,* "silver"[5] (cf. Arab. *ṣirf,* "pure, unmixed"); Ugar. *ṣrp* in the form *mṣrp* may mean "refine" and may otherwise (as a

ṣārap. C. Baldauf, "Läutern und prüfen im AT: Begriffsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu ṣrp und bḥn" (diss., Greifswald, 1970), esp. 3-75, 160-67; P. Collini, "Il 'contributo' dei profeti alla formazione del lessico biblico della metallurgia," *RivB* 32 (1984) 315-25; R. J. Forbes, *Studies in Ancient Technology,* VII (Leiden, ²1966); VIII (Leiden, ²1971); IX (Leiden, ²1972); J. C. Greenfield, "Ugaritic Lexicographical Notes," *JCS* 21 (1967) 89-93, esp. 91-92; M. Heltzer, *The Rural Community in Ancient Ugarit* (Wiesbaden, 1976), esp. 80-81; E. Jenni, *HP,* esp. 163, 210; J. L. Kelso, *The Ceramic Vocabulary of the OT. BASORSup* 5-6 (1948), esp. nos. 93-94; M. Sæbø, *Sacharja 9–14. WMANT* 34 (1969), esp. 78-83; → בחן *bḥn,* II, 69-72; → חקר *ḥāqar,* V, 148-50; → כשל *kāšal,* VII, 353-60; → נסה *nissâ,* IX, 443-55.

1. See *HAL,* II, 625b; III, 1057-58.
2. *AHw,* III, 1083-84.
3. *AHw,* III, 1086.
4. *AHw,* III, 1114-15.
5. ContiRossini, 226.

expressions (though no antonyms) and particularly verbs for "test," especially → בחן *bḥn*, which occurs 6 (or 7) times as a synonym of *ṣrp* (Ps. 17:3; 26:2; 66:10; Prov. 17:3; Jer. 9:6[7]; Zech. 13:9; also Isa. 48:10 if *bᵉḥantîḵā* is to be read instead of *bᵉḥartîḵā*, "elect, choose";[15] cf. 1QIsa[a]), then → נסה *nissâ* piel (Ps. 26:2); also verbs for "purify," such as *zqq* (piel, Mal. 3:3; pual ptcp., "purified, refined," Ps. 12:7[6]), → ברר *bārar* (piel, Dnl. 11:35; hithpael, 12:10), → לבן *lbn* (hiphil, 11:35; hithpael, 12:10),[16] → טהר *ṭāhar* (piel, Mal. 3:3), and the adj. *ṭāhôr* (Ps. 12:7[6]); also the related adj. → כבס *kāḇas* (piel), "wash" (Mal. 3:2, act. ptcp.); and finally also verbs meaning "remove, eliminate," e.g., *hgh* II (Prov. 25:4) and → סור *sûr* (hiphil, Isa. 1:25). The subst. ptcp. *ṣōrēp* (Isa. 41:7; Jer. 10:9) can also be accompanied by *ḥārāš*, "craftsman," and the subst. *maṣrēp* (Prov. 17:3; 27:21) by *kûr*, "(small) smelting oven."[17]

III. General Use. As these findings already suggest, the root *ṣrp* tends to be used figuratively and metaphorically. The semantic field is relatively well defined.

1. *The Verb ṣārap.* Although the verb is largely governed by substantive usage,[18] the nonparticipial forms offer the more promising point of departure for an examination. When in Jgs. 7:4 Yahweh says with regard to the people who have assembled for war, *wᵉʼeṣrᵉpennû*, the question arises whether a basic meaning of "eliminate" might be in view. This passage, however, is better understood in connection with the other prophetic and cultic use of *ṣrp* in the sense of "view," since it is through a testing or assessment that the suitable soldiers are to be selected or chosen.

The peculiar prophetic use of the word first comes to expression in Isa. 1:25 when God says, "I will turn my hand against you [Zion]; I will smelt away/refine *(ʼeṣrōp)* your dross as with lye and remove all your alloy." This metaphor (cf. 1:22a) refers to the smelting process by which silver (or gold) is "cleansed/refined" (cf. Prov. 25:4).[19] This metaphorical language is also used in Jeremiah's oracular indictment and judgment of the people (6:29), in Deutero-Isaiah's retrospective of the catastrophe of exile (Isa. 48:10), and later with reference to the eschatological remnant of the people (Zech. 13:9) and in the individual sense with reference to the fate of the "wise" or of the "many" in the eschatological drama (Dnl. 11:35; 12:10). Such individual use is also found in cultic poetry in connection with assertions (Ps. 17:3; cf. 105:19) as well as in entreaties to God (26:2, impv.). The people can also give thanks to God in the Psalms (66:10): "For you, God, have tested us; you have refined us as silver is refined" (the retrospective in 66:8-12 probably refers to the exile rather than to the wilderness sojourn;[20] cf. Isa. 48:10; also Lam. 1:13; 2:3-4; 4:2). In all of these passages, God is consistently the subject and people the object of the action.

---

15. → בחר *bāḥar (bāchar)*, II, 73-87.
16. See Kelso, no. 81.
17. See Kelso, nos. 94-95.
18. See II.1 above.
19. Concerning this process, cf. in addition to Kelso also Forbes, VIII, 196-266; H. Weippert, *BRL*², 221-22; G. Sauer, *BHHW*, II, 1206-7.
20. See H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150* (Eng. trans. 1989), 35-38.

Jer. 9:6(7) can serve as a transition to the participial usage, which is somewhat more varied. Here God says to his people, "I am their smelter [*ṣôrᵉp̄ām*, qal ptcp. with suf.] and will test them *(ûḇᵉḥantîm)*." In Mal. 3:2-3 (piel ptcp.), Yahweh's messenger anticipates the coming day of judgment by pointing out that Yahweh "is like a refiner's fire and like fullers' soap; he will sit as a refiner *(wᵉyāšaḇ mᵉṣārēp̄)* and purify the silver, and he will purify the descendants of Levi and refine them like gold and silver." Elsewhere the act. ptcp. *ṣôrēp̄* is used in the sense of "smelter, refiner" to refer more generally to a "goldsmith" or "smith of precious metals" (Jgs. 17:4; Neh. 3:8,32;[21] Prov. 25:4;[22] Isa. 40:19; 41:7; 46:6; Jer. 10:9; 10:14 par. 51:17). Jer. 10:2-16; 51:15-19,47-49,52, and especially Deutero-Isaiah use the word either directly or indirectly in the prophetic polemic against idols and their production. Elsewhere the pass. ptcp. *ṣārûp̄* (Ps. 12:7[6]) and fem. *ṣᵉrûpâ* (Ps. 18:31[30] par. 2 S. 22:31; Ps. 119:140; Prov. 30:5) are used predicatively, the subject in every instance (cf. also Ps. 105:19) being God's or Yahweh's "word/saying," with the relatively rare *'imrâ* (pl. *'ᵃmārôṯ*, Ps. 12:7[6]).[23] In this context Ps. 12:7(6) is of interest both theologically and archaeologically in its assertion that "the promises of Yahweh are promises that are pure, silver refined in a furnace on the ground, purified seven times."

2. *The Nouns maṣrēp̄ and ṣōrᵉp̄î.* Although the extremely restricted use of the substs. *maṣrēp̄* (Prov. 17:3a par. 27:21a) and *ṣōrᵉp̄î* (Neh. 3:31) concurs with the uses of the verb already discussed, the parallel passages in Proverbs, commensurate with wisdom thinking, refer to a person's reputation in a more general sense. "Like silver in the crucible *(maṣrēp̄)* and gold in the furnace *(kûr)*, so a person's reputation is tested." The hapax legomenon in Neh. 3:31 probably refers to "metal smelters" as a group and represents either a specialized collective term in the sense of "trade guild" for goldsmiths or a scribal error of the pl. *haṣṣōrᵉp̄îm*.[24]

IV. Theological Considerations. The characteristic theological aspects of this root can be summarized under several main points.

1. By and large, Yahweh is the subject of the action not only in Jgs. 7:4 (Dtr?), a passage influenced by the ideology of holy war, but also in prophetic metaphors incorporating references to smelting techniques used for refining precious metals, metaphors that were probably also determinative for Isaiah (cf. 1:22a,25). In both cases this metaphorical language vividly underscores God's preeminent power within history. Prophetic allusions to the refinement of precious metals incorporate the people's profound suffering into the prophetic interpretation of history not only with regard to God's future judgment (Isa. 1:25; Jer. 9:6[7]), but also as a retrospective on the sufferings of the

---

21. See T. Yamashita, *RSP*, II, 67.

22. Regarding textual considerations, see *BHS;* also, e.g., O. Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos (Proverbia)*. *BK* XVII (1984), 294-96, 298-99.

23. *HAL*, I, 67b.

24. See *BLe*, §63w; *HAL*, III, 1058a.

exile, when the people were tested "in the furnace of adversity" (Isa. 48:10). The "refining" God effects through suffering was a vehicle not only of judgment but also of his coming salvation (Dnl. 11:35; 12:10; Zech. 13:9; Mal. 3:2-3).[25]

2. God's "refining," however, involves not only the axis of judgment and salvation, but also the question of the "purity" of the people of God in the sense of their authenticity and integrity. It thus probably also involves God's "pedagogy" in that his will is to "purify" Zion rather than to destroy it (Isa. 1:25), which also means "removing the wicked" from his people (Jer. 6:29; also Dnl. 10–11; Zech. 13; Mal. 3). References are also made to the "purity" of God's own word with respect to its authenticity and reliability. It is "purified seven times" (Ps. 12:7[6]), and like precious metal it too is precious and priceless; the believer thus "loves" it (119:140; also 18:31[30] par. Prov. 30:5).

3. Finally one notes that while the older passages focus on the people, the book of Daniel focuses on individual believers. This shift does not, however, necessarily represent a linear development, since passages within both cultic (cf. Ps. 17:3; 26:2; 119:140) and wisdom contexts (Prov. 17:3; 27:21; cf. 25:4-5) also focus on the individual.

V. Qumran and LXX. The root occurs 14 times in the Qumran writings,[26] where it generally follows the semantic lead of the OT. The term *maṣrēp* refers to the test preceding acceptance into the *yaḥaḏ* of Qumran (1QS 1:17-18; CD 20:27). This period of testing, however, points beyond itself and already anticipates eschatological purification (1QS 8:4; 4QpPs 37:2,19; 4QFlor 2:1; 4Q177 (Cat[a]) 5-6:3), which is also called "God's purification" *(maṣrēp 'ēl;* 1QM 19:9). In Qumran too the purifying power of this refinement is explicated metaphorically as the smelting and refining of metals (1QM 17:1; 1QH 5:16).

Although the LXX uses a variety of terms to render this root, the most prominent is *pyroún,* with 16 occurrences.

Sæbø

---

25. See also III.1 above concerning Lamentations.

26. F. Lang, "πυρόω *pyróō,*" *TDNT,* VI, 939.

קבב *qbb*

Contents: I. Etymology, Occurrences, Meaning. II. OT Use. III. LXX.

I. Etymology. The Heb. root *qbb* is a secondary form of → נקב *nqb* and is etymologically related to Pun. *qbb*, "to curse,"[1] and Tigre *qabba*, "to despise, abuse, ignore."[2] The occurrences in the Deir ʿAlla inscription are uncertain or fragmentary.[3]

The root occurs 14 times in the OT, including 10 times in the Balaam story (Nu. 22–24) and twice each in Job and Proverbs (also once in Sirach). In Job 3:8 E. Ullendorff derives *yiqqᵉḇuhû* from *nqb* and translates, "may the lights of day break through it [the night]."[4] Job 5:3 is disputed.[5] W. Rudolph also reads a niphal of *qbb* in Jer. 31:22 instead of *nᵉqēḇâ*, viz. *nᵉqabbâ tᵉsôḇaḇ gᵉḇir(â)*, "the accursed woman turned into a lady."[6] The MT is probably preferable as *lectio difficilior*.

As regards meaning, one can note that in the Balaam story the verb alternates with → ארר *'rr*, "curse" (see below), and that both there and in Prov. 11:26 it contrasts with *brk* and in Nu. 23:7-8 parallels *zāʿam*, "curse, scold." In the latter passage one has the impression that *qbb* was perceived as being somewhat weaker than *'rr*.

II. OT Use. Most of the occurrences are in the Balaam story in Nu. 22–24, where *qbb* is found 10 times and *'rr* 5 times with the same meaning. Balak wants Balaam to curse/bewitch Israel (22:6 and 23:7 with *'rr*, then 22:11,17; 23:11,13,25,27; 24:10 with *qbb*). This shift is generally assessed as a criterion for distinguishing between different sources (with *'rr* belonging to J and *qbb* to E),[7] though some scholars disagree.[8] Balak expects the curse to go into effect immediately. In any event, nowhere does the text say nor is it necessary that the curse expressed by *qbb* is carried out "with the support of magical actions."[9] Indeed, in 23:8 Balaam makes the curse dependent on God, hesitating to curse those whom God has not cursed (23:8 par. *zāʿam*) and instead blessing Israel. Although Balak believes Balaam could at least speak in a

---

qbb. J. Scharbert, "'Fluchen' und 'Segnen' im AT," *Bibl* 39 (1958) 1-26, esp. 14-17; → ארר *'rr*, I, 405-18; → קלל *qll*.

1. *DNSI*, II, 977, uncertain reading.
2. See *WbTigr*, 249; E. Littmann, "Das Verbum der Tigresprache," *ZA* 14 (1899) 28.
3. Deir ʿAlla, II, 17; IXa 3; Xa 3; cf. H.-P. Müller, "Einige alttestamentliche Probleme zur aramäischen Inschrift von Dēr ʿAllā," *ZDPV* 94 (1978) 57.
4. E. Ullendorff, "Job III 8," *VT* 11 (1961) 350-51; cf. II below.
5. H. H. Rowley, *Job. NCBC* (1980), 58, lists the most important among the numerous emendations suggested; see below.
6. W. Rudolph, *Jeremia. HAT* I/12 (³1968), 199; *HAL*, III, 1060b; cf. *BHS*.
7. M. Noth, *Numbers. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1968), 177.
8. W. Gross, *Bileam. Literar- und formkritische Untersuchung der Prosa in Num. 22–24. SANT* 38 (1974), 81-83.
9. C. A. Keller, "קלל *qll* to be light," *TLOT*, III, 1143; → ארר *'rr*, I, 416-17.

completely neutral fashion (23:25), Balaam repeats that he can do only what Yahweh tells him to do (v. 26).

The use of *qbb* in Proverbs is unambiguous. Prov. 11:26 says that people curse those who stingily hold back grain, while a blessing is on the head of those who sell their excess to those who need it. "Those who give will receive, and miserliness is its own punishment."[10] Prov. 24:24 again uses *qbb* together with *z'm,* asserting that "whoever says to the wicked, 'You are innocent,' will be cursed by people, abhorred by nations," perhaps a reference to reproach in the more general sense rather than to curses in the usual sense.

Job 3:8 contains Job's familiar wish that the night of his birth be cursed by the *'ōr^e^rê-yôm.* We may leave in abeyance the question whether *yôm* or *yām,* "sea," is to be read here, the latter suggested by the ensuing reference to Leviathan. What is noteworthy instead is the parallel use of *qbb* and *'rr.*

Job 5:3 is difficult. MT reads, "I have seen a fool taking root, but suddenly I cursed *(wā'eqqōḇ)* his dwelling *(nāweh).*" Destruction of the dwelling place does not seem to be the result of the curse, but rather the reverse. Some translations preserve the MT and translate "I had to curse," though a better option might perhaps be to read *wayyuqaḇ,* "was cursed" (e.g., T. K. Cheyne, et al.). Many follow Duhm and read *wayyirqaḇ,* "started to crumble," though this verb does not fit the subject well. *BHS* suggests a derivation from Arab. *qabba,* "dry out," while the LXX reads *ebrṓthē,* "was devoured," and the Syr., *'bd'.*

Finally Sir. 41:7 says that "children will curse an ungodly father, for they suffer disgrace because of him" (*hāyû bûz* according to the Masada ms.; ms. B is damaged; the LXX reads *mémphetai,* "are reproached, criticized").[11]

III. LXX. The LXX generally translates *qbb* as *katarásthai,* though in isolated instances also as *arásthai* or *epikatarásthai.* It translates Prov. 11:26 as: "those who hold back grain, may they leave some of it for the nations *(hypolípoito).*" Prov. 24:24 reads *epikatáratos.* Concerning Job 5:3 and Sir. 41:7, see II above.

Ringgren

10. G. Wildeboer, *Die Sprüche. KHC* XV (1897), 35.
11. On the text see Y. Yadin, *The Ben Sira Scroll from Masada* (Jerusalem, 1965), 18.

thus for a late dating are not compelling,[13] one should probably date the text to the monarchy.[14] The unique combination using *qbl* is striking considering that *lqḥ mûsār* occurs 11 times in the OT (Proverbs, Jeremiah, Zephaniah). Even though *ysr/mûsār* often implies chastising instruction, here "the primary purpose of instruction *(yāsar)* is to communicate knowledge in order to shape specific conduct . . . needed to master the problems of life."[15] This notion is underscored by the par. *ʿēṣâ,* the advice one receives in important life situations. Use of a different verb here along with the imperative may suggest a semantic shift. The focus moves from universal considerations to specific, engaged, or active acceptance for the sake of mastering life; a person is then prepared to avoid dangerous laziness and is capable of helping the poor and living commensurately with God's word.

The author twice uses *qbl* piel in Job 2:10, a passage that is part of a presumably late addendum encompassing 1:20b-21 and 2:1-10[16] and thus to be classified as a late text. Although 1:21 and 2:10 are comparable, the change from *lqḥ* to *qbl* suggests a semantic shift. Horst is probably correct in suggesting that *qbl* expresses "(voluntary, consciously concurring) acceptance, reception, or appropriation" in a more specific fashion than the more general term *lqḥ,* though such personally engaged agreement or concurrence seems less emphasized than the intensification of the qal generally inhering in the piel.[17]

1 Ch. 12:19(18) similarly attests the notion of conscious acceptance. Although the presence of the classical narrative with an object prompted Japhet to date Chronicles before Ezra,[18] Gunneweg is probably correct in assuming the presence of an archaic expression.[19] David is initially mistrustful and hesitant to accept some Benjaminites and Judahites who come to his stronghold; Amasai's enthusiastic praise of David, however, prompts him to accept them (1 Ch. 12:17-19[16-18]). Here the verbal meaning "accept, receive," clearly implies conscious personal acceptance.

The use of *qbl* piel in 1 Ch. 21:11 (par. 2 S. 24:12) is also noteworthy.[20] Because David has transgressed by taking a census, he is told to "choose" among three kinds of misfortune. The issue, however, is not that he may choose one of the three (as in 2 S. 24:12), but rather in a more harsh sense that he must accept one as punishment.[21]

3. *Accept/Receive as an Order.* Est. 9:20-32 is an addendum to a book that was not written before 300 B.C.E. in any case, and this late dating supports the use of *waw* + per-

---

13. O. Eissfeldt, *The OT: An Intro.* (Eng. trans. 1965), 474.
14. W. McKane, *Proverbs: A New Approach. OTL* (1970), 415.
15. → יסר *yāsar,* VI, 129, 131.
16. L. Schmidt, *De Deo. BZAW* 143 (1976), 168.
17. F. Horst, *Hiob 1 (1–19). BK* XVI/1 (^{4}1983), 29.
18. S. Japhet, "Supposed Common Authorship of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah Investigated Anew," *VT* 18 (1968) 330-71, esp. 334-38.
19. A. H. J. Gunneweg, *Esra. KAT* XIX/1 (1985), 26.
20. Both E. Bertheau, *Die Bücher der Chronik. KEHAT* XV (^{2}1873), 180, and W. Rothstein and J. Hänel, *Kommentar zum ersten Buch der Chronik. KAT* XIII/2 (1927), 368, believe that the passage is a later addendum.
21. See W. Rudolph, *Chronikbücher. HAT* I/21 (1955), 142.

fect instead of the narrative as "characteristic of later Hebrew."[22] The semantic development of *qbl* piel seems to point in the same direction in vv. 23,27, where both the verb's form and its use without an object immediately attract attention. The context involves the observance of the Feast of Purim enjoined by Mordecai in a letter (9:20-23). Here the verb has acquired a legal dimension with the meaning "accept as an order/stipulation" and does not require an object.

4. *Sirach.* The use of *qbl* piel in Sirach in part follows the tradition just discussed. Sir. 50:12 recounts the reception of pieces of sacrificial meat.

The verb is probably used in 34/31:3ab to emphasize how the rich person is able to "take and take" without expending any serious effort. In contrast to the enduring needs of the poor, such people are in a position to receive both wealth and additional pleasures.

In Sir. 41:1d *lᵉqabbēl taʿᵃnûg* sounds almost like a fixed expression. According to mss. B and M, at issue is the energy to accept the pleasures of life (in a completely general sense) and to enjoy them.

The use of the verb in Sir. 36:26a(24a) suggests the notion of conscious personal acceptance with the assertion: *kōl zāḵār tᵉqabbēl ʾiššâ.* Because one cannot impute the same meaning here as for *lqḥ ʾiššâ* in the sense of "marry," and since nothing implies a pejorative meaning, one can say that a woman is in a position to accept personally a man as a spouse. Sir. 15:2 underscores this meaning by comparing the openness of wisdom with the *ʾēšeṯ nᵉʿûrîm* in the sense that wisdom comes to meet disciples and accepts (welcomes) them.

5. *Stand Opposite (Aggressively).* In Sir. 12:5 the hiphil form of *qbl* means "attack someone." The passage advises caution toward the *rāšāʿ* (12:3). One should particularly avoid giving such people anything dangerous *(kᵉlê lōḥēm)* since they might then turn it against those (whence the hiphil) who give it to them.

The hiphil meaning "stand opposite" is found in addenda to P, namely, Ex. 26:5 and 36:12, which stipulate that loops be made corresponding to those opposite them (*maqbîlōṯ hallulāʾōṯ;* cf. Ugar. *qblbl*).

6. *qōḇel.* The LXX construes the term *qoḇollô* in Ezk. 26:9 (from **qōḇel*) according to the Aramaic as a preposition, translating *apénantí sou.* Contextually, however, it must be understood as "a noun describing a siege instrument" (cf. Vulg. *arietes*).[23]

IV. Qumran. The notion of taking something upon oneself in 4Q171(4QpPs 37), II, 9(10) recalls Job 2:10. Here the poor *(ʿᵃnāwîm)* are promised that they will possess the land because they have accepted (*qbl* piel) humiliation and penance *(môʿēḏ hattaʿᵃnîṯ).* CD 9:22 uses *qbl* piel in the sense of personal acceptance in reference to the accep-

---

22. See H. Striedl, "Untersuchung zur Syntax und Stilistik des hebräischen Buches Esther," *ZAW* 55 (1937) 80.
23. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1983), 28.

qiḇṣayim, and *y^eqaḇṣ^e'ēl,*[7] the verbal forms occur 127 times in the OT in all stems except hiphil/hophal, including 38 times in the qal, 31 in the niphal, 49 in the piel, once in the pual, and 8 in the hithpael. The root *qbṣ* does not occur in Biblical Aramaic, which uses *knš,* "assemble," instead (Dnl. 3:2-3,27).

3. *LXX.* The LXX frequently uses the same verb for *qbṣ* as it does for other verbs of "collecting," including especially *synágō,* though in religious contexts it also uses *déchomai.*[8]

II. Noun Forms. The rather rare nominal forms include two place-names. The first, *qaḇṣ^e'ēl,* "El assembles," occurs in a list of Judean cities from the age of Joshua (Josh. 15:21).[9] It is located in southwestern Judah (its exact location is unknown) and was the home of Benaiah, leader of the Davidic mercenaries (2 S. 23:20; 1 Ch. 11:22). It may also be identical with the city *y^eqaḇṣ^e'ēl* in Neh. 11:25 in a list of Judah's inhabitants, a name that in some mss. and versions was accommodated to the form *qaḇṣ^e'ēl,* with *y^eqaḇṣ^e'ēl* probably representing the original form.[10] Josh. 21:22 mentions the unidentified city *qiḇṣayim* in a list of Levitical cities in Ephraim alongside Gezer and Beth-horon (Shechem was a free city rather than a Levitical city). Various anomalies in the enumeration suggest that the city *yoqm^e'ām* in the otherwise identical list in 1 Ch. 6:53 is not identical with *qiḇṣayim,* and rather that both cities were listed alongside one another in an earlier list.[11]

Ezk. 22:20 uses *q^eḇuṣâ,* "assemblage," in an oracle of judgment against Jerusalem. Yahweh will gather *(qbṣ)* Jerusalem's inhabitants in judgment just as (so Tg., LXX) one gathers metals within a smelting furnace (vv. 19-20). The notion of gathering Israel for judgment with Yahweh as the subject occurs elsewhere in Ezekiel, who alongside the gathering of the exiles for the salvific age also refers to Jerusalem (16:37), to Israel in the wilderness (20:35), to foreign nations such as Egypt (29:5), and to the judgment on Gog (39:17).[12] Some interpreters suggest a conjecture as an aid to understanding *qibbûṣayiḵ,* "your collection," in Isa. 57:13,[13] though *BHS* correctly no longer mentions this conjecture. Mic. 1:7 equates the gathering together of idols (*qbṣ* piel) with the "wages of a prostitute."[14] Isa. 57:5-6 suggests that such a collection may also be meant in Isa. 57, though such can only be surmised. Ugaritic parallels similarly suggest a collection of living beings. A more neutral meaning in the sense of "goods, acquisitions" may be meant, or even a summary of the preceding enumeration of transgressions or a reference back to the works that come to nothing (v. 12).

---

7. See II below.
8. Grundmann, 57.
9. M. Noth, *Das Buch Joshua. HAT* I/7 (1971), 93.
10. *HAL,* II, 430a; III, 1064a; Y. Aharoni, *The Land of the Bible* (Eng. trans. ²1979), 109.
11. Aharoni, *Land of the Bible,* 303; a different view is taken by Noth, *Joshua,* 126.
12. Concerning such assembling at the time of salvation, see IV.3 below.
13. *BHK;* C. Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1969), 323 with n. g: *šiqqūṣayik.*
14. H. D. Preuss, *Die Verspottung fremder Religionen im AT. BWANT* 92 (1971), 133-34.

III. Synonyms. Among the synonyms without a specifically associated object, *'āsap,* "collect, gather," occupies a preeminent position; it occurs more frequently than *qbṣ,* is semantically broader, and occurs throughout the OT. The two terms are occasionally used synonymously, e.g., Gen. 49:2; Isa. 11:12; 43:9; 62:9; Ezk. 11:17; 29:5; 39:17 (+ *bô'*); Joel 2:16 (+ *qhl*); Mic. 2:12; 4:6; Hab. 2:5; Zeph. 3:8.[15] By contrast, *kns/ knš* occurs only during the postexilic period (11 times), when it takes over the function of *qbṣ* and *'sp* (cf., e.g., the note in *BHS* concerning Mic. 1:7). A similar situation applies to *qhl* (39 occurrences, primarily in P and Dtr texts), which often refers to the worship assembly. The remaining verbs for "collect, gather" are generally associated with specific objects, such as *'rh* II (twice), "pick, harvest" (fruits), → לקט *lāqaṭ* (37 times), "harvest, gather" (food), *qwh* II (twice), "collect" (water; cf. *miqwâ*), *qšš* (8 times), "gather" (wood, stubble), *rkš* (5 times), "gather, acquire" (possessions). Only → יעד *yā'aḏ,* during the exilic-postexilic period with the secondary meaning "assemble," offers a genuine parallel to *qbṣ.*

IV. Verb.

1. *Qal.* The use of the qal is attested in a fairly consistent fashion throughout the OT. In contrast to the piel, only 3 times is Yahweh the subject of the qal (Ezk. 22:19-20; Zeph. 3:8); both passages involve Yahweh's anticipated judgment on Israel or the nations. In a divine discourse Hab. 2:5 criticizes tyrants who "gather" nations as illegitimate possessions (i.e., repression). In connection with religious texts, *qbṣ* parallels *'sp* (Hab. 2:5 [cry of woe]; Zeph. 3:8 [judgment discourse]) and is a simultaneous act with *qhl* (Joel 2:16 [call to penitence]). Otherwise *qbṣ* occurs largely in secular contexts, and only Ps. 41:7(6) uses it metaphorically to refer to the "gathering" of mischief by one's enemies. The remaining passages all focus on specific people as the subject and on equally specific things or people as the objects within a concrete, generally ordinary situation. As is also the case with *'sp,* the qal of *qbṣ* does not exhibit any specialized meaning. Objects of such gathering can include grain (Gen. 41:35,48), booty (Dt. 13:17), or goods in general (Prov. 13:11; 28:8). Differently than in Qumran, acquisition in general or of silver and gold for the temple (2 Ch. 24:5) is viewed positively. In the vast majority of passages, however, the objects are people who are associated as a group either through some previously shared qualification or through common interests. One common reference is to the gathering of men for war (Jgs. 12:4; 1 S. 28:1,4; 29:1; 2 S. 2:30; 3:21; 1 K. 20:1; 2 K. 6:24; 2 Ch. 25:5), where *qbṣ* is used in a neutral fashion to refer both to Israel and to its enemies. These passages, as also Gen. 41, probably date to the preexilic period (excepting 2 Ch. 25:5). Various other people can be assembled in various other contexts. The people can be gathered together for a national assembly (2 K. 10:18; Neh. 7:5), prophets to prove their abilities (1 K. 18:19-20; 22:6; 2 Ch. 18:5), or other groups for various purposes, including for building the city wall

15. In this regard cf. M. Görg, "Eine formelhafte Metapher bei Joel (2,6) und Nahum (2,11)," *BN* 6 (1978) 12-14; P. H. Schüngel, "Noch einmal zu qibbᵉṣû pā'rûr Joel 2,6 und Nah 2,11," *BN* 7 (1978) 29-31.

(Neh. 5:16), for a wedding (Est. 2:3), for a coup (2 Ch. 23:2), etc. Strikingly, people are only rarely gathered together for worship (1 S. 7:5; 2 Ch. 15:9; Joel 2:16).

2. *Niphal, Hithpael.* The niphal is used both reflexively in the sense of "assemble (gather) together" and passively in the sense of "be gathered together," though the reflexive usage seems to predominate.[16] Only Ezk. 29:5 and Est. 2:8,19 are unequivocally passive, while Isa. 56:8 and 60:7 could be interpreted either way. The subjects are always living beings. As with the qal, secular usage predominates. Certain groups of people assemble or come together for a specific purpose. In Gen. 49:2 it is for Jacob's blessing; 1 S. 25:1 for Samuel's burial; Jer. 40:15 for the new beginning undertaken by those who stayed behind; Ezr. 10:1,7,9 for the annulment of mixed marriages; Neh. 4:14(20) for building the wall; 2 Ch. 13:7 for Jeroboam's uprising; 32:4 for work; Josh. 10:6 and 1 S. 28:4 for war. Religious events are the goal of such gathering in 1 S. 7:6; 1 Ch. 13:2; 2 Ch. 15:10; 20:4, alongside which *qbṣ* niphal is increasingly used in such contexts. Similar to the qal, it refers to such gatherings in anticipation of Yahweh's judgment, though now understood eschatologically and not specifically as judgment on Israel. In postexilic apocalyptic texts, Yahweh assembles animals to implement his judgment on the nations, including birds of prey in judgment on Edom (Isa. 34:15; cf. 34:16 piel), birds and animals of the field in judgment on Gog (Ezk. 39:17) or similarly on Egypt (Ezk. 29:5, where fish serve only as part of the comparison). Finally in Joel 4:11(3:11) the nations gather for Yahweh's eschatological day of judgment.

More frequently, however, the niphal is used in a positive sense. Both Deutero-Isaiah and Trito-Isaiah use *qbṣ* to refer to the impending salvific age in a fashion resembling the use of the piel. Moreover, both use *qbṣ* only in the discourses of Yahweh. In Isa. 43:9; 45:20 (+ *bô'* and *ngš*); 49:18 (= 60:4); 60:7, Israel's adversaries or all the nations gather (at Zion) to praise Yahweh's glory and Zion. The monotheistic and universalistic features resonating here fit the late exilic period and thereafter. The notion of God's eschatological salvific acts concerning Israel are also incorporated (Ps. 102:23[22]). Just as the nations gather together in a demonstration of Yahweh's power, so also does Yahweh assemble Israel in Jerusalem (Isa. 48:14; 56:8 [cf. piel]). Hos. 2:2(1:11), a passage dating to the exilic-postexilic period, also promises that the sundered kingdoms of Israel and Judah will be gathered in during the age of salvation.[17]

In this regard and similar to the qal, *qbṣ* hithpael exhibits an exclusively secular character; moreover, all passages exhibit reflexive meaning and consistently refer to specific groups of people who assemble for a specific purpose. That purpose is war (cf. qal) in Josh. 9:2; Jgs. 9:47; 2 S. 2:25; Jer. 49:14 (Yahweh discourse). Isa. 44:11 (Yahweh discourse) reproaches those who produce idols.[18] Only in 1 S. 7:7 do the Israelites gather for worship. Except for Isa. 44:11 and Jer. 49:14, all passages are part of

---

16. Contra *HAL,* III, 1063.

17. So Jörg Jeremias, *Der Prophet Hosea. ATD* XXIV/1 (1983), 34-35; a different view is taken by H. W. Wolff, *Hosea. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1974), 24ff.

18. Preuss, *Verspottung,* 208ff.

the Dtr History; Jgs. 9:47; 1 S. 22:2; 2 S. 2:25 date reliably to the pre-Dtr period, though not 1 S. 8:4.

3. *Piel, Pual.* The use of *qbṣ* to refer to the gathering of Israel for the salvific age already mentioned in connection with the niphal is by far the most common use in the piel. With few exceptions (Isa. 13:14; 22:9; 62:9; Hos. 9:6; Joel 2:6; Mic. 1:7; Nah. 2:11[10]; 3:18), Yahweh is consistently the subject (Yahweh's spirit in Isa. 34:16). Secular meaning is involved only in Isa. 22:9; 62:9; Joel 2:6; Nah. 2:11(10), though even these verses stand in religious contexts. Isa. 22:9 reprimands the Jerusalemites for having collected water without Yahweh's help (Siloam pool). In a fashion unusual for the piel, Isa. 62:9 describes the harvest, certainly and thus characteristically in connection with the salvific age. Joel 2:6, similar to Nah. 2:11(10), articulates the terrors preceding the day of Yahweh. Dt. 30:3-4, to which Neh. 1:9 alludes, exemplifies the majority of occurrences, all of which except Hos. 8:10 and 9:6 (oracles against Israel[19]) date to the exilic-postexilic period. If Israel repents in exile, Yahweh will have compassion,[20] will gather together *(qbṣ)* the dispersed among the nations, and lead them back to the land (*bô'* hiphil). This notion is especially prominent in the great writing prophets, for whom *qbṣ* piel becomes a soteriological technical term often contrasting Yahweh's previous judgments (e.g., Neh. 1:9; abandonment in Isa. 54:7;[21] driving out in Isa. 11:12;[22] 56:8; Jer. 23:3; 31:10; Ezk. 20:34; Mic. 4:6). Passages that use *qbṣ* parallel with → ישׁע *yš'*, "rescue," show how painful the consciousness of the destruction and dissolution of the one people of Yahweh must have been (Ps. 106:47 = 1 Ch. 16:35, here also → נצל *nṣl;* Zeph. 3:19; Zech. 10:8). The gathering of Israel from exile is understood as a return (Zech. 10:10, *šûḇ,* hiphil) and as a new exodus (Ezk. 20:34; 34:13).[23]

Yahweh's actions in this context are often compared to those of the shepherd who gathers in his dispersed flock (explicitly in Isa. 40:11; Jer. 31:10; Ezk. 34:13; Mic. 2:12; cf. Arab. *qubaḏah,* "shepherd who takes good care of the flock"; similarly also Ps. 23:1), a metaphor otherwise often applied to the ruler in the ancient Near East in describing his aid to those in need of protection.[24] The gathering of the dispersed, the primary task of the shepherd, is emphasized here as the work of Yahweh alone in an intentional contrast over against other nations and their shepherds (kings, gods), and the metaphor is rounded out by the reference to Israel as lambs (Isa. 40:11). Mic. 4:12 uses the metaphor of the farmer who gathers in sheaves. Just how fixed this use of *qbṣ* became in its reference to Yahweh's salvific actions can be seen in several oracles of judgment against other nations that emphasize how those nations have no one to gather them in (Isa. 13:14 [Babylon]; Nah. 3:18 [Nineveh]; Jer. 49:5 [Ammonite refugees]).

---

19. Jeremias, *Hosea,* 103, 113.
20. → שׁוב *šûḇ;* → רחם *rḥm.*
21. → עזב *'āzaḇ,* X, 584-92.
22. → נדח *nāḏaḥ,* IX, 235-41.
23. → יצא *yāṣā',* VI, 225-50.
24. Jeremias, *TDNT,* VI, 486.

None of those nations has a "good shepherd." Indeed, the metaphor of Yahweh as shepherd can function virtually as an antitype for Israel's bad shepherds (i.e., kings; Jer. 23:3; Ezk. 34:13).

Ezekiel's use of the piel occasionally goes beyond the customary framework. In the oracle against Jerusalem, Yahweh gathers her "lovers" to witness against her (Ezk. 16:37). Ezk. 20:34 similarly focuses on a gathering for judgment. A purifying judgment takes place in the wilderness before the assembled attain final salvation (20:41; 38:8 pual) as articulated in an oracle against Gog. In Ezekiel's theology of history, which is divided into stages, salvation comes only through judgment. Ezk. 29:13 takes the soteriological use of *qbṣ* to its extreme in asserting that Yahweh will save not only Israel, but even the dispersed Egyptians. This use of *qbṣ* is unique and contrasts with that in Joel 4:2(3:2), where the nations are gathered for the day of Yahweh. At the same time, references to God's immediate and sovereign salvific actions on behalf of Israel as expressed by *qbṣ* are countered by relatively few passages involving judgment on Israel (Isa. 22:9 against Jerusalem; Hos. 8:10 and 9:6 as oracles against Israel; Ezk. 16:37 [see above]; Mic. 1:7 in connection with the production of idols,[25] though cf. also the oracles against foreign nations). Hence *qbṣ* piel articulates the hope of the exilic community in Yahweh's compassion on which the dispersed depend (e.g., Mic. 4:6). The exiles and the community of the second temple believe that Yahweh alone can implement the Dtn program of unifying the people of God; he will do so by gathering together both Israel and the nations in an eschatological display of his sovereign power.

V. Qumran. The root *qbṣ* occurs 11 times in the Qumran writings published thus far. Three passages from the *pesharim* (1QpHab 8:11; 9:5; 4QpNah 1:11[26]) focus on the accumulation of illegitimate wealth by Jerusalem priests. 4Q177 (Catena[a]) 7:4 and 19:5 allude to Ezk. 25:8 and 22:20.[27] 4Q381 76-77:1 might allude to Ezk. 39:17. 4QM[a] (491) 16:4 (no par. in 1QM) mentions the assembly of all Israel in Jerusalem (cf. Ezr. 10:9; Jdt. 16:22 Vulg.). Occurrences in fragmentary texts include 4Q171 13:6; 509 3:4; 515 19:1; 11QT 55:8.

Mommer

---

25. See II above.

26. According to E. Lohse, *Die Texte aus Qumran* (Munich, [2]1971), 264.

27. So J. Strugnell, "Notes en marge du volume V des 'Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan,'" *RevQ* 7 (1969/71) 243-45, 247.

Deuteronomy, 4 times in the Dtr History, once in the Chronicler's History, 4 times in the prophets, and once in Ecclesiastes.

II. The Role of Burial in the Various Collections.

1. *Pentateuch.* The JE strata of the Pentateuch mention explicitly only the graves of Jacob and Rachel. At his own request, Jacob's sons take him from Egypt to Canaan when he dies and inter him there in Goren-ha-Atad (Abel-mizraim; Gen. 47:30; 50:1-11). His favorite wife was interred in a grave *(qᵉḇûrâ)* with a pillar *(maṣṣēḇâ)* on the way to Ephrath (Gen. 35:19-20; 1 S. 10:2). By contrast, the acquisition of a single grave for Abraham and Sarah is one of the only major events P recounts about this patriarch (Gen. 23:1-20). Here the focus is on the *'ᵃḥuzzaṯ qeḇer,* legal claim of possession. The grave represents the only tiny parcel the patriarch can call his own in the promised land. "In death they [the patriarchs] were heirs and no longer 'strangers.' A very small part of the Promised Land — the grave — belonged to them."[4]

Not only Abraham and Sarah, but also Isaac and Rebekah, Leah and Jacob are interred in the cave at Machpelah (Gen. 49:30ff.; 50:13). With regard to all of them, the authors consider it important to recount explicitly both the burial and the locale. Peculiarly, the notion of being "gathered *('sp)* to one's people" is mentioned in 10 instances before the burial. Only Aaron is "gathered to his people" on Mt. Hor with no mention of any grave (Nu. 20:24-26). Hence the ancestors' graves become visibly more significant in the later pentateuchal strata than in the earlier ones. As important as P does indeed consider the "gathering together of the family" after the patriarchal deaths, the legal prescriptions nonetheless still insist that every corpse in a grave defiles anyone who touches it (Nu. 19:16-18).

2. *Dtr History.* It is of considerable importance to many of the traditions in the Dtr History that the various legendary heroes have an appropriate death and that they are interred in the grave of their "fathers" (ancestors in the larger sense). Such is the case with Gideon (Jgs. 8:32), Samson (16:31), Asahel (2 S. 2:32), Abner (3:32), Ahithophel (17:23), and Saul and Jonathan (21:14). Only in the case of Barzillai does the text recount that the grave was that of the mother as well as the father (19:38[37]). The books of Kings consider it essential to mention that the Israelite and Judean kings are gathered to their ancestors and are then interred in the family grave. Here too being gathered to one's ancestors is mentioned before the burial,[5] and its omission is considered an incisive divine verdict on a king's rule. Was the skin-diseased King Amon buried in a tomb in the garden of Uzza lest his condition defile even his dead ancestors (2 K. 21:26)?

Those who after death are not interred in the family grave have a hapless end (1 K. 13:22). In a reverse fashion, the divine promise is that one will indeed be gathered to one's ancestors in *šālôm* (2 K. 22:20).

After interment among one's ancestors, the next best possibility is to be interred in

4. G. von Rad, *Genesis. OTL* (Eng. trans. ²1972), 250.
5. Tromp, 169-70.

being laid to rest in one's grave, calling it the *bêṯ hā'ôlām* (Ps. 49:12[Eng. 11]; Eccl. 12:5; Tob. 3:6), though the question remains whether this reference is intended metaphorically or literally.[6] Dying without a *qᵉḇûrâ* is horrible (Eccl. 6:3). Job considers it incomprehensible and outrageous that the wicked often reach their graves uncontested and that watch is often even kept there (21:32). Of course, the grave is not really viewed as a desirable goal. Job considers his own days already extinct and now looks forward only to the grave, which offers him no consolation (17:1).

III. Religious Meaning. The deceased are carried to the grave in a solemn ceremony including laments and rites of self-deprecation on the part of family, friends, and servants.[7] Royal burials are different from those for normal persons, with the entire people taking part and with rituals of fire (2 Ch. 16:14; 21:19; Jer. 34:5). Such interment rites, however, lack all religious reference in the narrower sense. Neither Yahweh nor any pagan deity is mentioned; indeed, Israel's God is not even mentioned when kings or prophets conduct the interment ceremony (2 S. 3:31-35; 1 K. 13:30).

Later legal texts proscribe some mourning rites in consideration of Yahweh (Lev. 19:27-28; 21:1-6; Dt. 14:1), a proscription generally understood as an anti-Canaanite measure. These texts are so late, however, that it is hard to imagine the authors having had any real familiarity with original Canaanite customs. Is the intention to prevent the funeral entourage from identifying itself too excessively with the (unclean) deceased and thus damaging their relationship with Yahweh?

Distinguished individuals such as Abraham and Rachel even take part in their descendants' lives from the grave (Isa. 63:16; Jer. 31:15-17). Specialists could invoke the deceased as *'ᵉlōhîm* and direct oracular inquiries to them (1 S. 28), though this custom was soon viewed as illegitimate competition to the only appropriate divination of the future in Yahweh's own oracles (2 K. 23:24; Isa. 8:19, etc.).[8] By contrast, not a single reliable text suggests that in ancient Israel those who died under unfortunate circumstances were considered capable of exerting any negative influence on the living.[9]

One cannot determine the extent to which ancient Israel supported a cult of the dead in which the deceased were supplied with gifts beyond actual interment.[10] Dt. 26:14 considers it a transgression against Yahweh to offer part of one's tithe to the dead. There may have been *peger* offerings for kings at the Zion temple during the preexilic period (Ezk. 43:7-9), though the prophet denounces this practice as a grievous defilement of the sanctuary.[11] Sacrifices for the dead are, however, mentioned during the Hellenistic period (Sir. 30:18; Tob. 4:17). At an earlier period, Isa. 65:4 reprimands those who "sit inside tombs" (*yšb;* to make inquiries of the dead? for meals with them?) and engage in other superstitious rites.

---

6. Wächter, 77 (metaphorically); Welten, 737 (lit.).
7. → ספד *sāpaḏ*, X, 299-303.
8. → אוב *'ôḇ ('ôbh)*, I, 130-34; → ידע *yāḏa'*, V, 448-81.
9. Spronk, 251.
10. Ibid., 247.
11. → פגר *pāgar*, IX, 477-82.

IV. Epigraphic Evidence. OT views concerning the grave are confirmed by several epigraphic witnesses found in and on Iron Age graves in Palestine. An inscription over the entrance to the grave of a domestic steward in Silwan warns that the grave contains neither silver nor gold and that all intruders will be cursed.[12] The covering plate of a second grave on the Mount of Olives notes that "the bones of Uziyahu, King of Judah, were brought here," and that the grave may not be opened.[13] That the inscription was not composed until the 1st century B.C.E. shows how long the idea endured in Jerusalem that kings could indeed continue to exert an influence even after death.

Two recent finds are even more significant. An 8th-century tomb inscription from Khirbet el-Qôm near Hebron is dedicated to a certain "Uriyahu, the rich," about whom it presumably says, "Blessed is/be *(brk[t?])* he by *(l) YHW* and . . . by his Asherah" (? *l'šrth*). A stylized hand reaches down toward the grave from above.[14] Regardless of how the exact translation should read or what status is ascribed to the Asherah(ta?), the inscription does in any case envision Yahweh as blessing the deceased in the grave.[15]

In a necropolis on the southern edge of Jerusalem, archaeologists found two silver plates on which early forms of the blessing in Nu. 6:22-26 were etched and which were placed in the graves on behalf of the deceased.[16] The wish "May Yahweh bless you and keep you, may his countenance shine toward you," can only mean that the deceased is accompanied not by his God's blessing but by the very radiance of his God's countenance itself (in contrast to Ps. 88).

V. Grave Finds from the Iron Age. Archaeological findings from Iron Age Palestinian graves are of interest in this context only to the extent that they provide information about the religious significance of such interment. Although most of the burial chambers have been discovered in the limestone formations, such burial was not necessarily representative for the broader population since the earthen graves that were probably the norm rarely leave behind much in the way of archaeological evidence (one exception being those in Qumran). Funerary culture makes a seamless transition from the

---

12. *KAI* 191.

13. *TGI*², 81, no. 55.

14. W. G. Dever, "Iron Age Epigraphic Material from the Area of Khirbet El-Kôm," *HUCA* 40/41 (1969/70) 139-204.

15. Concerning this discussion, cf. A. Lemaire, "Les Inscriptions de Khirbet El-Qôm et l'Ashérah de YHWH," *RB* 84 (1977) 595-608; S. Mittmann, "Die Grabinschrift des Sängers Uriahu," *ZDPV* 97 (1981) 139-52; J. A. Emerton, "New Light on Israelite Religion: The Implications of the Inscriptions from Kuntillet 'Ajrud," *ZAW* 94 (1982) 2-20; Z. Zevit, "The Khirbet el-Qôm Inscription Mentioning a Goddess," *BASOR* 255 (1984) 39-47; M. O'Connor, "The Poetic Inscription from Khirbet el-Qôm," *VT* 37 (1987) 224-30; S. Schroer, *In Israel gab es Bilder. OBO* 74 (1987), 33-34.

16. G. Barkay, *Ketef Hinnom: A Treasure Facing Jerusalem's Walls* (Jerusalem, 1986); H. N. Rösel, "Zur Formulierung des aaronitischen Segens auf den Amuletten von Ketef Hinnom," *BN* 35 (1986) 30-36.

(Canaanite) Late Bronze Age to the (Israelite) Iron Age, with "no particular funerary customs seeming to be specific only to Israelite graves."[17] Necropolises were generally located outside settlements, as was the case in Jerusalem, where several cemeteries have been found.[18] Although the Ugaritic custom of constructing burial chambers beneath houses has not been attested in Palestine (despite 1 S. 25:1; 1 K. 2:34), most of the chambers were designed as family crypts with niches along the side walls to accommodate several bodies.

Some graves contain a depression in one corner or even a kind of lower level (Ketef Hinnom) into which the bones were collected after the soft tissue decayed. The wooden or stone ossuaries popular during the Roman period served the same purpose.[19] After the soft tissue putrefied, the bones were apparently "gathered to the ancestors" once and for all in a "second burial" (Meyers). Although coffins were rare,[20] excavations show that most deceased persons received various burial objects for their final journey, including jewelry, clothing, amulets, vessels, etc.,[21] presumably to make postmortal existence more bearable.[22] Such objects, however, are strikingly absent from the Qumran graves. Although unequivocal evidence for an ongoing offering of food for the deceased is lacking, provisions for libations are widely attested. The four (?) graves found on the southeast hill of Jerusalem pose a special problem insofar as they were located within the inhabited part of the city. Some interpreters consider these to be the royal graves of the Davidides who attained special status.[23]

VI. Summary. In the OT, interment in a grave appears as a kind of parareligious realm. The deceased is taken to the final resting place in a ritual ceremony involving neither Yahweh nor any pagan deities (and certainly not Ba'al). The conviction that the dead lived on in some fashion in the grave was predominant. The deceased became one with their ancestors in the grave or at the moment of death in the sense of a "corporate personality." Only extrabiblical inscriptions from the period of the monarchy occasionally suggest that Yahweh's blessing might accompany and continue to protect the deceased.

One striking feature is how rarely the grave is associated with the underworld; the notion of being buried and the attendant understanding of the *qeḇer* wholly lack the unsettling, hostile features otherwise associated with *šᵉʾôl*. References to the deceased abiding in their graves rarely mention *šᵉʾôl* (such is the case in the Pentateuch excepting the story of Joseph) and vice versa.[24]

---

17. Welten, 735.
18. E. Otto, *Jerusalem, die Geschichte der Heiligen Stadt* (Stuttgart, 1980), 81-83.
19. *BRL²*, 273-75.
20. Ibid., 269-73.
21. Survey in M.-B. von Stritzky, *RAC*, XII, 438-41.
22. Wächter, 185-86.
23. Otto, *Jerusalem*, 79-80; but cf. J. Simons, *Jerusalem in the OT* (Leiden, 1952), 194-225.
24. See II.5 above.

VII. 1. *LXX.* The LXX consistently translates the verb *qbr* as *tháptein,* then *qeḇer* generally as *táphos,* occasionally as *mnēmeíon,* and *q*ᵉ*ḇûrâ* as *mnēmeíon, mnḗma, táphos,* or *taphḗ.*

Koch

2. *Qumran.* The root *qbr* occurs 11 times in the Qumran texts (including 8 in 11QT), once in Murabbaʿat, and 6 times in as yet unpublished texts from 2Q-10Q. According to 1QM 11:1, the enemy's corpses *(pgr)* are crushed without being buried so that they suffer the worst possible disgrace even beyond death. 4QMᵇ 1:10 completes the text of 1QM 19:10-11; after the decisive eschatological battle, the enemies felled by God's sword will remain unburied. In a *pesher* to Ps. 79:2-3(?), 4QTanḥ 1-2, I, 4 sees the corpses of the Jerusalem priests that no one will bury. According to 11QT 50:6, contact with a grave causes a person to become unclean (allusion to Nu. 19:16).

11QT 50:10-11 asserts that a dead fetus makes its mother as unclean as a grave. This stipulation has no OT precedent, nor were its harshness and scope (11QT 50:11-19) incorporated by later rabbis, prompting Y. Yadin to suspect that in the Temple Scroll version it represents a polemic against liberal views.[25]

The purity regulations in the Temple Scroll represent a peculiar amalgamation of OT sources, with regulations concerning the burial of the dead paralleling those concerning the separation of persons with skin disease. 11QT 48:12-14 enjoins that "you shall not do as the nations do; they bury their dead everywhere, they bury them even in their houses. Rather you shall set apart areas in the midst of your land where you shall bury your dead." The designation of four cities (l. 14) recalls the OT establishment of cities of asylum (cf. Dt. 4:41ff.).

11QT 64:11 stipulates that the corpses of those who have been "hanged on trees" are to be buried the same day.[26] A letter from Murabbaʿat (46:5) praises the humane qualities of a certain Euphronius (?), who is kind toward the poor and buries the dead.

Fabry

---

25. Y. Yadin, *Temple Scroll,* I-IIIA (Jerusalem, 1983), I, 336ff.

26. See J. Maier, *The Temple Scroll: An Intro., Trans., and Comm. JSOTSup* 34 (Eng. trans. 1985), 134.

קדד *qdd*

Contents: I. Etymology and Meaning. II. Distribution and OT Use. III. LXX, Vulgate.

I. Etymology and Meaning. The Heb. verb *qdd* is related to Akk. *qadādu(m),* "to bow very low, bend,"[1] which appears in Old Akkadian and Babylonian as well as in an Akkadian text from Ugarit.[2] The relationship with *qoḏqoḏ* assumed earlier (e.g., Kimchi) cannot be demonstrated, nor can the postulated distinction between *qdd* I and II (e.g., *GesTh*) or the derivation of the Hebrew verb from a biconsonantal root *qd* with the meaning "cut."[3] The Sam. Pentateuch apparently attests both *qwd* and *qdd.*[4] Biblical Hebrew always uses the word in what is known as the "aramaizing" qal imperfect with the familiar strengthening of the first consonant by *dagesh forte.*[5] Moreover, the word always stands almost immediately before a form of the verb *hištaḥ*ᵃ*wâ,*[6] whereby the meaning of *qdd* is often construed as a "preparatory action" *(HAL)* for the second verb in the sense of "bow, kneel down." Kreuzer suggests that *qdd* refers primarily to the "movement of bowing," *hištaḥ*ᵃ*wâ* to the "ideal aspect of veneration."[7]

II. Distribution and Use. The verb *qdd* occurs in the OT in Gen. 24:26,48; 43:28; Ex. 4:31; 12:27; 34:8; Nu. 22:31; 1 S. 24:9(Eng. 8); 28:14; 1 K. 1:16,31; 1 Ch. 29:20; 2 Ch. 20:18; 29:30; Neh. 8:6). It is not necessary to emend *qāḏ*ᵉ*rû* to *qaḏ*ᵉ*ḏû* in Jer. 14:2.[8]

In the OT *qdd* almost always immediately precedes a form of *hištaḥ*ᵃ*wâ* and as such can probably be understood as an archaic expression preserved through formulaic OT use (so Kreuzer). As in Akkadian, Hebrew often adds *'appayim,* a "relational accusative" (1 S. 24:9[8]; 28:14; 1 K. 1:31; 2 Ch. 20:18; cf. Nu. 22:31),[9] while the direction of the movement, whether or not combined with *'appayim,* is often designated by *'arṣâ* (Ex. 34:8; 1 S. 24:9[8]; 28:14; 1 K. 1:31; 2 Ch. 20:18; *'ereṣ* only 1 K. 1:31, but cf. *BHS;* cf. also Neh. 8:6). The generally closely associated forms *wayyiqqōḏ* and *wayyištaḥû,* etc., are followed by the prep. *l*ᵉ with the obj. Yahweh (Gen. 24:26,48; Neh. 8:6; cf. 2 Ch. 20:18), the king (1 K. 1:16,31), or both (1 Ch. 29:20). The two verbs also often

---

qdd. S. Kreuzer, "Zur Bedeutung und Etymologie von *Hištaḥ*ᵃ*wāh/yšṭḥwy,*" *VT* 35 (1985) 39-60.

1. *AHw,* II, 890-91; *CAD,* XIII, 44-45.
2. RS 25.460.9 = *Ugaritica,* V (Paris, 1968), 267.
3. W. Gesenius, *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das AT,* ed. F. Mühlau and W. Volck (Leipzig, [9]1883), s.v.
4. So *HAL,* III, 1065b.
5. *GK,* §67g.
6. → חוה *ḥwh,* IV, 248-56.
7. Kreuzer, 46, 53.
8. So P. Haupt, "Critical Notes on Micah," *AJSL* 26 (1909/1910) 213.
9. *AHw,* II, 891; *CAD,* XIII, 45.

stand alongside one another without any further relational qualification (Gen. 43:28; Ex. 4:31; 12:27; 2 Ch. 29:30). The subjects of such bowing are always individuals or several persons, sometimes even an entire people, all of whom stand in a subordinate or dependent position toward a superior, who can be either another person or a king or deity. Joseph's brothers bow before him (Gen. 43:28), David before Saul (1 S. 24:9[8]), Bathsheba before David (1 K. 1:16,31), Abraham's servant before Yahweh (Gen. 24:26,48), and even Saul before the spirit of Samuel evoked by the medium at Endor (1 S. 28:14). Even Balaam bows before the "angel of Yahweh" who stands before him with a drawn sword (Nu. 22:31). The entire people bow before Yahweh (Ex. 4:31; Neh. 8:6), prompted more or less by their protagonist (Moses, Ezra). In 2 Ch. 20:18 King Jehoshaphat takes the lead, and "all Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem fell down before Yahweh *(lᵉhištaḥᵃwōṯ lᵉyhwh).*" Nowhere in the OT are the two otherwise intimately associated verbs *qdd* and *hštḥwh* more widely separated than here.

Although occasionally an author does not explicitly name the person or deity before whom someone bows, the context rarely leaves the question open. Such is the case, e.g., in Ex. 34:8, where it is obvious that Moses bows down before Yahweh. It is less clear, however, in 12:27b, which says only that the people bowed down and worshiped after Moses' Passover catechesis. This ambiguity arises because the final words of this verse do not necessarily refer directly to the "[proto-] Deuteronomistic"[10] regulations concerning the Passover lamb (12:24-27a) and may come from the hand of J.[11] Kohata draws attention to the common features shared by this half-verse and 4:31b, the latter of which makes clear that the people bow before Yahweh. Such is allegedly also the case in 12:27b.

In the later OT books, bowing and doing obeisance apparently become a fixed part of the Yahweh cult and can be initiated by kings or other leading figures. In 2 Ch. 29:30 Hezekiah and his officials prompt the Levites to praise Yahweh with psalms (*hll* piel) while they "sang praises with gladness, and they bowed down and worshiped." After Ezra blesses Yahweh (*brk* piel), the people answer "'Amen, Amen,' lifting up their hands," and then "bow their heads and worship Yahweh with their faces to the ground" (Neh. 8:6). Even King David is said to have prompted the people to engage in this cultic action. The assembly blesses *(brk)* Yahweh, "the God of their ancestors," and then they bow their heads and prostrate themselves before both Yahweh and the king (1 Ch. 29:20). In such cases bowing and prostration conclude the cultic ritual.

III. LXX, Vulgate. The LXX uses a form of *kýptein* in 11 instances (Gen. 43:28; Ex. 4:31, etc.), but uses *eudokeín* in Gen. 24:26,48. Only in 1 Ch. 29:20 does it use *kámptein tó gónu,* and in 2 Ch. 29:30 *píptein.* Its inclination to use participial forms of these verbs suggests that the LXX considered bowing to be an essential part of proskynesis (*proskyneín* is almost always the translation of *hištaḥᵃwâ*).

---

10. See M. Noth, *History of Pentateuchal Traditions* (Eng. trans. 1972; repr. 1981), 30 n. 106.

11. Cf., e.g., B. S. Childs, *Exodus. OTL* (1974), 184; F. Kohata, *Jahwist und Priesterschrift in Exodus 3–14. BZAW* 166 (1986), 270-71; a different view is taken by J. Van Seters, "The Place of the Yahwist in the History of Passover and Massot," *ZAW* 95 (1983) 174.

The Vulg. translates *qdd* with verbs such as *inclinare* (Gen. 24:26; 1 S. 24:9[8], etc.), *(in)curvare* (Gen. 43:28; Ex. 12:27, etc.), or *summittere* (1 K. 1:31), often in connection with *pronus,* "bending down forward." Indeed, it sometimes uses *pronus* alone to indicate *qdd* (Gen. 24:48; Ex. 4:31; Nu. 22:31). In 2 Ch. 29:30 it uses *curvato genu* (cf. LXX in 29:30).

The only occurrence in Qumran is found in a fragmentary text (4Q520 1:3).

Mulder†

קָדִים *qāḏîm*

Contents: I. Etymology. II. OT Use: 1. Overview; 2. East, East Side, Easterly Direction; 3. East Wind, Primeval Storm. III. LXX, Qumran.

I. Etymology. Etymologically the Biblical Heb. noun *qāḏîm,* "east, east side, easterly direction," or "east wind, primeval storm,"[1] is apparently related to, among others, Arab. *qadim,* "old, ancient, in existence since eternity";[2] OSA *qdm,* ptcp. "preceding, one who is superior," prep. *qdm/qdmy,* "in front of";[3] Eth. *qadīmu,* adv. "at first, beforehand," cf. Tigr. *qadam,* "in front of, beforehand, earlier";[4] Ugar. *qdm,* subst. "east, east wind," prep. "in front of, opposite";[5] Syr. *qᵉḏîmā',* "what was earlier, foremost"; Mand. *qdim(a),* "former, ancient, primeval";[6] cf. also Sam. *qiddᵉm.* In Rabbinic Hebrew/Aramaic, *qāḏîm/qᵉdîmtā'* generally means "east wind."[7]

II. OT. Use.

1. *Overview.* The noun *qāḏîm* occurs 69 times in the OT, including twice each in Ex. 10:13 and Ezk. 45:7, though largely in the book of Ezekiel (52 times excluding 45:7, where some scholars read *pᵉ'aṯ qāḏîm* instead of MT *pᵉ'aṯ qēḏmâ,* though such reading

---

qāḏîm. R. Albertz and C. Westermann, "רוּחַ *rûaḥ* spirit," *TLOT,* III, 1202-20; P. Fronzaroli, "Studi sul lessico comune semitico. IV. La religione," *AANLR* 8/20 (1965) 246-69, esp. 258, 265; T. Kronholm, "Guds Ande i Gamla testamentet," *TTK* 55 (1984) 241-57; D. Lys, *Rûach: Le souffle dans l'AT. Études d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses* 56 (Paris, 1962); F. Stolz, *Strukturen und Figuren im Kult von Jerusalem: Studien zur altorientalischen, vor- und frühisraelitischen Religion. BZAW* 118 (1970), esp. 87; → קָדַם *qāḏam;* → קֶדֶם *qeḏem.*

1. *HAL,* III, 1067-68; E. Jenni, "קֶדֶם *qedem* past times," *TLOT,* III, 1102-3; → קָדַם *qāḏam* (II).

2. Lane, I/8, 2986; R. Dozy, *Supplément aux Dictionnaires arabes* (Paris, ²1927), II, 324.

3. ContiRossini, 229; Biella, 446.

4. *LexLingAeth,* 463; *WbTigr,* 259.

5. For the subst.: *KTU* 1.100.62; 1.12, I, 8; cf. *UT,* no. 2208; *WUS,* no. 2389; *CML²,* 156; for the prep.: *KTU* 1.4, V, 45; VII, 40; 1.3, IV, 41; cf. M. Dahood, *RSP,* I, 322-23, nos. 481-82.

6. For Syriac see *LexSyr,* 647; for Mandaic, *MdD,* 405.

7. Jastrow, 1315; cf. also Fronzaroli, 258, 265.

is not compelling[8]). The word also occurs 3 times each in Genesis, Exodus, and Job, twice each in Hosea and Psalms, and once each in Isa. 1–39, Jeremiah, Jonah, and Habakkuk. Some conjecture *qāḏîm,* probably incorrectly, in 2 K. 19:26 par. Isa. 37:27 (cf. 1QIsa[a]: *hnšdp lpny qdym,* instead of MT *ûšᵉḏēpâ lipnê qāmâ*) and Ps. 129:6 (cf. *BHS*).

2. *East, East Side, Easterly Direction.* The semantic field of the OT noun *qāḏîm* remains almost exclusively[9] within the spatial connotations attaching to the root *qdm* (esp. *qāḏam* II). At least as regards *qāḏîm,* E. Jenni's assertion that "of terms in this word group, *qedem/qāḏîm* 'east' attained no particular theological significance" applies only with significant exceptions.[10] In its spatial meaning "east, east side, easterly direction," *qāḏîm* occurs in the OT almost exclusively in connection with Ezekiel's great vision of the new temple and the new land (chs. 40–48; also one occurrence in Ezk. 11:1; see below).

One philological consideration is that in most texts, *(haq)qāḏîm,* "east, east side" (40:19 [gloss?[11]]; 42:9), means "toward the east" (43:17; 44:1; 46:1,12; 47:1,2,3,18; 48:1,2,6,7,8,16), though it is sometimes construed with *he locale* (*qaḏîmâ,* 11:1; 40:6; 45:7; 47:1,18; 48:3,4,5,8,10,17,18,21,23,24,25,26,27,32), rarely *laqqāḏîm* (40:23; 41:14). In the meaning "easterly direction," *qāḏîm* functions consistently as the *nomen rectum* in construct exprressions, including *dereḵ haqqāḏîm,* "toward the east" (40:10, 22,32; 42:10,12,15; 43:1,2,4), *šaʿar haqqāḏîm,* "east gate" (40:44), *rûaḥ haqqāḏîm,* "east side" (only 42:16; otherwise generally in the meaning "east wind"[12]); cf. also *pᵉʾaṯ qāḏîm,* "east side," suggested by Zimmerli in 45:7 (though see 1 above).

This word has only a few theological focal points. According to Ezk. 8, the prophet, who had been active in the Babylonian exile, was taken up by a spirit and transported to Jerusalem in 592 B.C.E. In a renewed rapture (see 11:1ff.), he was present when Yahweh's glory (*kᵉḇôḏ yhwh,* 11:23) left the Jerusalem temple (which had an easterly orientation, chs. 8–11) toward the east apparently through the "east gate of the house of Yahweh" (*šaʿar bêṯ-yhwh haqqaḏmônî happôneh qāḏîmâ,* 11:1).

The account of the prophet's visionary tour from the east gate to the threshold of the holy of holies in 573 B.C.E. (40:1-37,47-49; 41:1-4) shows clearly that the path taken in measuring the temple started at the same "gateway facing east" (*šaʿar ʾᵃšer pānāyw dereḵ haqqāḏîmâ,* 40:6) applying to the conclusion of the measurements of the temple precinct (42:15-20; esp. v. 15).[13] After the prophet has followed the measurements, he is taken once again to the outer east gate (*wayyôliḵēnî,* 43:1; cf. 40:24) to see Yahweh's glory make its final entry (43:1-12; hence there is no contradiction between 43:1 and 42:15 as suggested by Hölscher, Gese, et al.[14]): "And there, the glory of the God of Is-

8. E.g., W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1983), 466.
9. Concerning Ps. 48:8(7), see II.3 below.
10. Jenni, *TLOT,* III, 1102.
11. See Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2,* 337-38.
12. See 3 below.
13. See the description of the outer east gate according to 40:5-16 in Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2,* 353.
14. See Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2,* 411.

Although the "west wind" *(rûaḥ yām)*[21] was naturally the predominant wind in Palestine, the OT makes almost no mention of it (Ex. 10:19 is of little relevance here); by contrast, the less frequent but often catastrophic east wind, the sirocco, which could dry up fresh vegetation in no time at all (Ezk. 17:10; 19:12; cf. also Ps. 103:16; Isa. 40:7), is mentioned with surprising frequency.[22] Many texts, however, merely describe the natural, external character of the east wind, noting how it scorches *(šdp)* the grain (Gen. 41:6,23,27), blows incomprehensibly to and fro over the entire earth (Job 38:24), dries up the fruit of the vine and strips it off (Ezk. 19:12), causes shipwrecks at sea (Ezk. 27:26), and shatters the ships of Tarshish (Ps. 48:8[7]? cf. also Job 1:19).

All these natural features of the east wind together with all their consequences, however, are at the same time manifestations of divine activities as described, e.g., in Ps. 78:26, which explains how "he [Yahweh] caused the east wind *(qāḏîm)* to blow in the heavens, and by his power he led out the south wind *(têmān)*."

In the Israelite understanding, then, it was Yahweh who caused the strong east wind (*rûaḥ qāḏîm 'azzâ,* Ex. 14:21 J?) to blow toward Egypt (cf. Ex. 10:13 E?). Hos. 13:15 recounts similarly how Yahweh causes the east wind, "a blast from Yahweh," to blow in from the wilderness and dry up Ephraim's fountains and springs precisely because Ephraim "pursued the east wind all day long" (12:2[1]). According to Isa. 27:8, it is Yahweh who leads his people away before the attacking Assyrians and scatters them "with his fierce blast in the day of the east wind."[23] In the parable of the potter and the clay, Jeremiah proclaims Yahweh's oracle to the people in view of the impending Babylonian onslaught: "Like the wind from the east, I will scatter them before the enemy" (18:17; cf. Ezk. 17:10; 19:12; Tyre, 27:26). In the tale of Jonah as well, it is God himself who brings the "sultry east wind" *(rûaḥ qāḏîm ḥ^arîšîṯ)* upon the prophet (*mnh* piel, 4:8).

Wisdom texts also refer to the east wind in a theologically significant fashion. The truly wise do not answer with inflated words or "fill themselves with the east wind" (Job 15:2). The east wind will lift up the wicked and sweep them away (27:21). Yet the path of the east wind remains one of God's incomprehensible mysteries (38:24).

The expression *rûaḥ (haq)qāḏîm* resonates occasionally with mythical implications. Such is particularly the case when Ps. 48, a probably postexilic song of Zion, recounts how the "divine terror" cripples and confuses the enemies such that "trembling took hold of them there, pains as of a woman in labor, as when an east wind shatters the ships of Tarshish" (vv. 7-8[6-7]). Although the latter metaphor derives ultimately from the Phoenician-Syrian sphere,[24] the notion of the mythical "primeval storm"[25] apparently also became part of the Zion tradition (cf. related texts such as Job 27:21; Isa. 27:8; Jer. 18:17; Ezk. 27:26).

---

21. → יָם *yām,* VI, 87-98, esp. III.1,2.
22. *AuS,* I/1, 103-9.
23. Concerning this unclear passage, see O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 13–39. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1974), 226-28.
24. See H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59* (Eng. trans. 1987), 475.
25. See Stolz, 87 n. 60.

probably from the original Canaanite-Phoenician inhabitants. On this view the Mediterranean Sea *(hayyām [haggāḏôl])*[18] refers to the "west,"[19] Mt. Zaphon (situated north of Ugarit) the "north,"[20] and the arid southern region *(negeḇ)* the "south,"[21] with *mizrāḥ* and *qeḏem* consistently representing the "east."[22] The noun *qeḏem* is used only twice in the absolute spatial sense "in the front, forward, east,"[23] appearing with *'āḥôr,* "behind," as its counterpart: "You hem me in, behind and before *('āḥôr wāqeḏem),* and lay your hand upon me" (Ps. 139:5). Job, abandoned by God, declares in his third response to Eliphaz the Temanite: "If I go forward/toward the east *(qeḏem),* he [the divine judge] is not there; or backward/toward the west *('āḥôr),* I cannot perceive him; on the left/in the north *(śᵉm'ôl)* he hides; and I cannot behold him; I turn to the right/to the south *(yāmîn),* but I cannot see him" (23:8-9). Elsewhere the OT uses *qeḏem* in its spatial meaning either in prepositional phrases *(miqqeḏem [lᵉ])* or as *nomen rectum* in various construct expressions.

The contexts attaching to the latter show that *qeḏem* by no means always refers to a geographically fixed area in the OT. The "eastern mountains" (*harᵉrê-qeḏem,* Nu. 23:7), whence Balaam allegedly came, seem to be located in Transjordan, possibly in Hauran[24] in the hinterlands of Deir ʿAlla, and are, of course, ideally suited for underscoring the origin of such seers among the eastern nomads.[25] By contrast, the "east country" (*'ereṣ qeḏem,* Gen. 25:6) to which the sons of Abraham's concubines are sent (whether meant as a historical or genealogical note) refers to an expansive region in southern Palestine and northwestern Arabia.[26] The "mountain of the east" (*har haqqeḏem,* Gen. 10:30), one of the boundaries of the Joktanites, cannot be reliably identified;[27] in any event it is probably not to be identified with the Jebal Ṭuwaiq on the northern edge of Mt. Sinai.[28]

Hence the *bᵉnê qeḏem,* the "people of the east" (Gen. 29:1; Jgs. 6:3,33; 7:12; 8:10; 1 K. 5:10[4:30]; Job 1:3; Isa. 11:14; Jer. 49:28; Ezk. 25:4,10), and the *yōšēḇ qeḏem,* the "inhabitants of the east" (Ps. 55:20[19]), are not always to be equated with the nomads and seminomads of east Jordan and refer rather in a more general fashion to the inhabitants of the Syrian-Arabian desert.[29] It seems to be of some theological significance that the Dtr History traces wisdom (cf. above concerning seers, Nu. 23:7) from the east and from Egypt, maintaining that "Solomon's wisdom surpassed the wisdom of all the people of the east *(ḥoḵmaṯ kol-bᵉnê-qeḏem),* and all the wisdom of Egypt" (1 K. 5:10[4:30]; cf. Isa. 2:6; also Jenni).

Only the context can clarify the spatial meaning of *miqqeḏem,* "in/to/from the east"

---

18. → ים *yām,* VI, 87-98.
19. → צפון *ṣāpôn.*
20. *HAL,* II, 414.
21. *HAL,* II, 665.
22. See Tallqvist, 105-85, esp. 125.
23. See Michel, 76.
24. W. Rudolph, *Der Elohist von Exodus bis Josua. BZAW* 68 (1938), 99; Müller, 61.
25. Müller, 61 n. 33.
26. See G. von Rad, *Genesis. OTL* (Eng. trans. ²1972), 261.
27. See C. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11* (Eng. trans. 1984), 528.
28. *HAL,* III, 1070a.
29. *GTTOT,* §35; *HAL,* III, 1070a.

("from the front" only in Isa. 9:11[12]; NRSV "on the east"). Abraham pitched his tent with Bethel on the west and Ai "on the east" (Gen. 12:8). Lot "chose for himself all the plain of the Jordan, and Lot journeyed eastward" (Gen. 13:11). Isa. 2:6 mentions "diviners from the east" (though the MT is problematic; cf. *BHS*). The geographical designation *miqqeḏem* (cf. also Gen. 2:8; 11:2; Zech. 14:4), however, cannot always and completely be distinguished from a temporal connotation. Although the garden in Eden does indeed lie "in the east" (Gen. 2:8), in the context of J it is also far removed temporally[30] (cf. temporal *minnîqeḏem*, Ps. 78:2).

The expression *miqqeḏem lᵉ* (8 occurrences) always articulates a relationship between a known or supposedly known area and a region in the east. Ai is located "east of" Bethel (Josh. 7:2; cf. Gen. 12:8), Riblah "east of" Ain (Nu. 34:11), and so on (cf. also Gen. 12:8; Jgs. 8:11; Ezk. 11:23; Jon. 4:5). Yahweh places the cherubim "at the east of the garden of Eden" (Gen. 3:24; the semantic shift in 3:22,24 over against 2:8 derives from a motif inserted at a later stage[31]).

As the directional reference "east," *qeḏem* is related to a whole series of other nouns that derive from the same root but cannot be addressed here,[32] including **qēḏem*, "east," occurring in the OT exclusively as the accusative of place *qēḏmâ* (25 times) and consistently meaning "toward the east" either in geographical descriptions (Gen. 13:14; 25:6; 28:14; Nu. 34:3,10,15; Josh. 15:5; 19:12,13; 1 K. 17:3; 2 K. 13:17), in instructions regarding the tabernacle (Lev. 1:16; 16:14; Nu. 2:3; 3:38; 10:5), or in connection with temple service (1 K. 7:39; 2 Ch. 4:10; Ezk. 8:16). This group also includes the specialized expression *pᵉʾaṯ qēḏmâ*, "on/toward the east side" (in a general geographical sense in Nu. 35:5; Josh. 18:20; in connection with the tabernacle in Ex. 27:13; 38:13, with the temple in Ezk. 45:7, where the MT should presumably be maintained; cf. *BHS*); also **qiḏmâ*, "opposite, over against," or also "east of" in spatial descriptions (Gen. 2:14; 4:16; 1 S. 13:5; Ezk. 39:11); finally the adj. **qaḏmôn*, "east" (fem. only, Ezk. 47:8) and the accompanying double suffixed adj. *qaḏmōnî/qaḏmônî* I (10 OT occurrences),[33] occurring 4 times with a temporal meaning ("formerly, earlier")[34] and 6 times with the meaning "east" (Ezk. 10:19; 11:1; also the reference to the Dead Sea as the "eastern sea," *hayyām haqqaḏmōnî*, Ezk. 47:18; Joel 2:20; Zech. 14:8; the pendant, the Mediterranean Sea, is accordingly called the "western sea," *hayyām haʾaḥᵃrôn*). Only Job 18:20 refers to "those in the east" (*qaḏmōnîm*, with *ʾaḥᵃrōnîm* as its pendant).[35]

3. *Prehistoric Times, Primeval Time.* Parallel to its spatial meaning, *qeḏem* also refers to a time prior to that of the observer, either relatively in the sense of "earlier" or absolutely in the sense of "prehistoric times, primeval time."[36]

---

30. See Westermann, *Genesis 1–11*, 210.
31. See ibid., 274.
32. → קָדַם *qāḏam* II.
33. See *BLe*, §61yθ.
34. See 3 below.
35. → קדים *qāḏîm*.
36. → עולם *ʿôlām*, X, 530-45.

Not surprisingly, being able to trace one's origin to the primeval period is considered particularly laudable, e.g., with reference to the Egyptian royal line (Isa. 19:11, to the extent the expression *malḵê-qeḏem* really does mean "kings of antiquity"; cf. *nsyky qdm*, "ancient princes," Sir. 16:7; the reference may also, of course, be to the "kings of the east"; cf. 1 K. 5:10[4:30]; Isa. 2:6[41]), the city of Sidon (Isa. 23:7), or the anticipated messianic ruler (Mic. 5:1; *qeḏem* and *yᵉmê 'ôlām* "refer according to Mic. 7:14-15,20 to the time of David [cf. Am. 9:11], the exodus from Egypt, and the patriarchs"[42]).

III. LXX. LXX translations reflect the confluence of spatial and temporal connotations exhibited by the OT use of the noun *qeḏem*. The most frequent translations are *anatolḗ* (20 times) and *archḗ* (14 times), though also *archaíos* (9 times) (cf. Delling, Schlier).

IV. Qumran. The use of *qeḏem* in the Qumran texts consistently follows the OT features already discussed. The word occurs 4 times in the Thanksgiving Hymns. 1QH 13:1 extols the divine "holiness from the eternal primeval age on [to all eternity]" (*qwdš mqdm '[wlm l'wlmy 'd]*, emendation with Carmignac from fr. 17:4), and 13:10 the works of creation, "for you have established them from before eternity" (*hkynwtmh mqdem 'wlm; qdm* in the next, fragmentary line also refers to the same primeval time). Finally, l. 12 speaks rather obscurely about the creation of something new *(ḥdšwt)* "to break asunder things anciently established *(lhpr qymy qdm)* and raising up the things of eternity *('wlm)*" (concerning such new creation, cf. 1QS 4:25). 1QH frs. 7:10 and 16:7 are too fragmentary to allow interpretation.

The introduction to the Damascus Document speaks of those who "depart from the way and abhor the precept," asserting that "from the beginning God chose them not" (*l' bḥr 'l bhm mqdm 'wlm*, CD 2:7). The following verse emphasizes that God "hated their generations" for shedding blood *(wyt'b 't dwrwt mdm*, though *mdm [middām]* might best be emended to *mqdm [miqqeḏem]*). Finally 19:2 says that community members are to live in camps "according to the ancient order of the land" *(ksrk h'rṣ 'šr hyh mqdm)*. 4QMᵃ (491) 11, I, 12 uses *qeḏem* to describe the divine throne on which "not a single king of the east/of old shall sit" (*bl yšbw bw kwl mlky qdm;* cf. also Isa. 19:11).[43] 4QDibHamᵃ (504) 8 (recto), 3, mentions God's "miracles from of old" *(npl'wt mqdm)*.

The noun *qeḏem* also occurs twice in the Temple Scroll, both times meaning "east" (*rwḥ hqdm*, 11QT 38:13, referring not, as is customary in the OT, to the "east wind"; it also occurs in the expression *bqdm mzrḥ*, 39:12, which is apparently the equivalent of simple *bqdm*, "in the east").

Finally the Heb. adj. *qdmwny*, "eastern, easterly," occurs in 1QM 2:12. 1QMyst (27)

---

41. See H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27* (Eng. trans. 1997), 232-33, 251.
42. Seybold, 109 n. 11; cf. also Beyerlin, 78-85.
43. See II.3 above.

east wind" (69 times), → קֶדֶם *qedem,* "in front, east, prehistoric times, primeval age" (61 times); **qēdem,* "east" (only as the acc. of place *qēdmâ*) (25 times, including Ezk. 45:7; perhaps read *p*ᵉ*'aṯ-qādîm* instead of MT *p*ᵉ*'aṯ-qēdmâ*[12]); **qadmâ,* "origin, former state, previous condition" (5 times; but the text of Ps. 129:6 is uncertain[13]); also **qidmâ,* "opposite, to the east of" (4 times),[14] **qadmôn,* "east" (Ezk. 47:8), *qadmōnî/qadmônî* I, "east, former, earlier" (10 times, though MT *haqqadmōnî* in 1 S. 24:14 is questionable), and *qadmōnî* II, collectively "the easterners" (Gen. 15:19), presumably also the place-name *q*ᵉ*dēmôṯ* (Dt. 2:26; Josh. 13:18; 21:37; 1 Ch. 6:64[Eng. 79]).[15]

In the Aramaic portions of the OT, *qdm* never occurs verbally, but only as *q*ᵒ*dam,* "before, with" (38 times in Daniel, 4 in Ezra), **qadmâ,* "before, against" (Dnl. 6:11[10]; Ezr. 5:11), and **qadmāy,* "earlier, first" (Dnl. 7:4,8,24).[16]

III. The Verb *qādam*.

1. *Occurrences.* The Heb. vb. *qādam* occurs 26 times in the OT, including 24 times in the piel (12 times in the Psalms; twice each in 2 Samuel, Job, Isaiah, Micah; once each in Deuteronomy, 2 Kings, Jonah, and Nehemiah; possibly also cj. in 1 S. 20:25) and twice in the hiphil (Job 41:3[11]; Am. 9:10). Although the texts and meaning of the 2 hiphil occurrences are uncertain, *qdm* in the intensive stem refers both to interpersonal relationships in the sense of "be in front, come before, meet, approach,"[17] and to the relationship between God and individual in the sense of "approach [with blessing, kindness, punishment]"[18] or between the individual and God in the sense of "come before [God respectfully, pleadingly, with thanksgiving, with offerings]."[19]

2. *Piel.* In isolated instances the piel of *qādam* exhibits the primarily spatial, relationally neutral meaning "be in front." Such is the case in a hymnic account of a cultic processional that is somewhat difficult to date (Ps. 68:25-28[24-27]): "The singers in front *(qidd*ᵉ*mû),* then *('aḥar)* the musicians, between them girls playing tambourines" (v. 26[25]; concerning the contrast between *qdm* and *'ḥr* [→ אחרי *'aḥ*ᵃ*rê* *('ach*ᵃ*rê)*], cf. Ps. 139:5, "behind and before," *'āḥôr wāqeḏem*). 1 S. 20:25 probably referred originally to a similarly neutral spatial positioning: "The king [Saul] sat on his seat [at the table], as at other times . . . Jonathan was in front of him [cj. *way*ᵉ*qaddēm* with LXX;[20] MT *wayyāqôm*], while Abner sat by Saul's side." Jon. 4:2 uses *qdm* piel in a unique parallel sense to mean "do something for the first time."[21]

---

12. Cf. *BHS; HAL,* III, 1070b.
13. See *BHS;* cf. K. Seybold, "Die Redaktion der Wallfahrtspsalmen," *ZAW* 91 (1979) 250 n. 18; M. Dahood, *Psalms III: 101-150. AB* 17A (1970), 232; *HAL,* III, 1070b.
14. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1983), 317 (on Ezk. 39:11).
15. See *GTTOT,* §337, no. 43; cf. §61.
16. *LexLingAram,* 145-47; Jenni, 1102.
17. → קרב *qārab.*
18. → בוא *bô',* II, 20-49; → יצא *yāṣā',* VI, 225-50.
19. → חוה *ḥwh,* IV, 248-56; *kāpap* niphal; → קרב *qārab.*
20. See H. J. Stoebe, *Das erste Buch Samuelis. KAT* VIII/1 (1973), 371, 377.
21. See Wagner, 100.

Several texts speak about "approaching" someone with beneficence, kindness, or generosity. Isa. 21:14 exhorts the inhabitants of Tema to "meet" (*qaddᵉmû* with LXX and others; MT *qiddᵉmû*[22]) the fleeing caravans of the Dedanites with (water and) bread. The assembly regulations in Dt. 23:2-9(1-8) (probably late material) similarly stipulate that neither the Ammonites nor the Moabites can be admitted to Yahweh's assembly because "they did not meet *(qiddᵉmû)* you [the Israelites] with food and water on your journey out of Egypt" (v. 5[4]; cf. Neh. 13:2). Sir. 15:2-3 invokes the same connotation metaphorically in the assertion that wisdom will come to meet those who fear God "with the bread of learning" and the "water of wisdom" just as a mother comes to meet her son or a faithful spouse her husband.

The use of *qdm* piel in the patriarchal blessing in Job 3:12a is unique. Job laments: "Why did knees come to meet/receive me [why was I taken onto someone's lap]?" *(qiddᵉmûnî birkāyim)*.[23]

In secular contexts *qdm* piel can also refer to negative or even mortally dangerous events that "encounter" a person.[24] A divine oracle asserts that "he [Sennacherib, king of Assyria] shall not come into this city, shoot an arrow there, come before it *(yᵉqaddᵉmennā)* with a shield" (2 K. 19:32 par. Isa. 37:33). Both liturgical and wisdom authors pick up on this use from military contexts. The royal thanksgiving hymn Ps. 18 recounts how "the cords of Sheol entangled me *(sᵉḇāḇûnî)*, the snares of death confronted me *(qiddᵉmûnî)*" (v. 6[5]; par. 2 S. 22:6). The petitioner's enemies and those who hate him "confronted me *(yᵉqaddᵉmûnî)* on the day of my calamity" (v. 19a[18a]; par. 2 S. 22:19a). Job similarly laments to God that "days of affliction come to meet me *(qiddᵉmûnî)*" (30:27b).

These liturgical and wisdom texts, of course, also resonate with theological overtones. Other passages using *qdm* speak even more specifically about the relationship between God and the individual.

The prayer in Ps. 59, e.g., evokes God's compassionate approach: "My God in his steadfast love will meet me *(yᵉqaddᵉmēnî)*, my God will let me look in triumph on my enemies" (v. 11[10]). The congregation similarly pleads: "Let your compassion come speedily to meet us *(yᵉqaddᵉmûnû)*" (79:8). Finally the "liturgy" in Ps. 21 recounts how Yahweh comes to meet *(tᵉqaddᵉmennû)* the chosen king "with rich blessings" (v. 4a[3a]).

By contrast, reference is also made to God's hostile, even vengeful approach in the fixed expression *qiddēm pānîm*, "confront someone's face." The prayer in Ps. 17 entreats God: "Rise up, O Yahweh, confront them [the wicked] *(qaddᵉmâ pānāyw)*, overthrow them!" (v. 13a).

Ps. 89, a royal psalm, uses the same expression, *qiddēm pānîm*, in a completely different fashion: "Righteousness and justice *(ṣeḏeq ûmišpāṭ)* are the foundation of your throne; steadfast love and faithfulness go before you *(ḥeseḏ weʾᵉmeṯ yᵉqaddᵉmû pāneyḵā)*" (v. 15). The ancient Near Eastern background to this idea of divine attrib-

---

22. Cf. *BHS* and Lescow, *ZAW* 84 (1972) 189.

23. → ברך *brk*, II, 279-308; cf. F. Rundgren, *Linguistica et philologica. Gedenkschrift B. Collinder* (Vienna, 1984), 391-96.

24. → קרה *qārâ*.

utes surrounding the king as "court servants" is apparently found in the Sumerian-Akkadian sphere, where truth, justice, etc., were understood as divine powers or protective spirits.[25]

The expression *qiddēm pānîm* can also refer to the cultic approach before God, as in the thanksgiving song Ps. 95: "Let us come into his presence *(nᵉqaddᵉmâ pānāyw)* with thanksgiving; let us make a joyful noise to him with songs of praise" (v. 2).

The twofold use of *qdm* piel, once parallel with *kāpap,* probably also derives from the cultic sphere: "With what shall I come before *('ᵃqaddēm)* Yahweh, and bow myself *('ikkap)* before God on high? Shall I come before him *(ha'ᵃqaddᵉmennû)* with burnt offerings, with calves a year old?" (Mic. 6:6). In this context, however, Lescow is probably correct in suggesting that both verbs derive originally from the secular rather than cultic sphere.[26] Such secondary cultic use of *qdm* piel can also, of course, be spiritualized as is the case in torah devotion: "I come before *(qiddamtî)* dawn and cry for help; I put my hope in your words. My eyes are awake *(qiddᵉmû)* before each watch of the night" (Ps. 119:147-148; possible Aramaic influence[27]).

3. *Hiphil.* The vb. *qdm* occurs twice in the hiphil according to the MT (Job 41:3[11]; Am. 9:10). The pericope encompassing Am. 9:7-10 probably represents "the literary distillate of later discussion concerning the fifth vision" (8:3-14), dating perhaps to the time just after the end of the "house of Jeroboam" in the year 745.[28] Am. 9:10 contains the threat: "All the sinners of my people shall die by the sword, who say, 'You will not bring about evil or allow it to meet *(lō'-taggîš wᵉṭaqdîm)* us.'" Some scholars suggest taking "evil" *(hārā'â)* as the subject of the sentence, in which case one can maintain the MT (with *qdm* hiphil meaning "meet, encounter," so NRSV), or read *ngš* niphal or *qdm* piel. One should presumably remain with *qdm* hiphil and understand it as an intensification.[29]

The second divine discourse in Job (40:6–41:26[41:34]) asks: "Who can confront me and be safe? Under the whole heaven, no one" (41:3[11]). Scholars often adduce the LXX in suggesting, though probably erroneously, the emendation *mî hû' qiddᵉmô wᵉyišlam* instead of MT *mî hiqdîmanî wa'ᵃšallēm.*[30]

IV. LXX. The LXX generally translates *qdm* piel as *prophthánein* (15 times),[31] though also as *synantán* (4 times) and with various other terms (including twice as

---

25. See H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150* (Eng. trans. 1989), 207 (Ps. 89:15[14]), with documentation; H. Ringgren, *Word and Wisdom* (Lund, 1947), 53ff.; → כסא *kissē',* VII, 248-50.

26. Lescow, *ZAW* 84 (1972) 188-89; cf. idem, *Micha,* 21-22; contra W. Beyerlin, *Die Kulttraditionen Israels in der Verkündigung des Propheten Micha. FRLANT* 72 (1959), 51; K. Koch, "Tempeleinlassliturgien und Dekaloge," *Studien zur Theologie der alttestamentlichen Überlieferungen. FS G. von Rad* (Neukirchen, 1961), 54-55.

27. See Wagner, 100.

28. H. W. Wolff, *Joel and Amos* (Eng. trans. 1977), 345, 347.

29. See ibid., 349.

30. E.g., G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 525, 527; cf. W. Eisenbeis, *Die Wurzel* שלם *im AT. BZAW* 113 (1969), 316-19.

31. See Fitzer, 91.

3. *Word Field.* In the OT the term *qodqōd* occurs only in poetic contexts and in a specific idiom.[4] Parallel terms include *rō'š*, "head" (cf. Ugar. *qdqd* par. *r'š*[5]), *pē'â*, "temple [of head]," **pōt*, "forehead," traditionally "female pudenda."[6]

This word field also includes *gulgōlet*, "skull," *mēṣaḥ*, "forehead, brow," **raqqâ*, "temple [of head]," also *mōaḥ*, "marrow, brain," *pānîm*, "face," and the terms for "bald head."[7]

Another parallel to *qodqōd* as the sensitive part of the body is → זרוע *zerôa'*, "arm," as opposed to *kap-regel*, "sole of the foot." This opposing term identifies *qodqōd* as having the basic meaning "highest part of the head," with *qodqōd śē'ār* referring specifically to the "top of the head."

Wherever *qodqōd* is used with the word field "hair," *śē'ār*, the key word *nāzîr*, "consecrated one" (cf. Nu. 6:2,5) appears, especially with verbs meaning "shear, cut."[8]

4. *LXX.* The LXX assumes that *qodqōd* occurs 9 times (not in Nu. 24:17; Jer. 2:16; 31[48]:45). The LXX translates it 6 times as *koryphḗ* (so also variant to Jer. 31(48):44 [end]) and once each as *kephalḗ*, *árchōn*, and *árchein*.

II. Concrete Meaning.

1. *"Cut Off, Shear."* Cutting off the hair of prisoners of war was a degrading humiliation and a sign of enslavement.[9] Yahweh threatens to "lay bare" the heads of the haughty daughters of Zion (? *śpḥ* piel;[10] traditionally *spḥ*, "make scabby" [or scribal error from *šph* piel, "make bare"?]) in Isa. 3:17 (par. *'rp* piel, "shave"; cf. 7:20). The notion of "cropping" one's hair (*r'h*, Jer. 2:16, cj. *ye'ārûk* to *'rh* piel[11]) is applied to Israel's own humiliation in Egypt (addendum from Jeremiah's later period?[12]). Both passages merge the concrete background with metaphorical meaning.

2. *"From the Sole of the Foot to the Crown of the Head."* The beauty of scheming Absalom (2 S. 14:25) as well as the loathsome sores on Job (Job 2:7; cf. Dt. 28:35) extend *mikkap raglô we'ad qodqodô*, "from the sole of his foot to the crown of his head" (cf. the expression with *rō'š* in Isa. 1:6; also Lev. 13:12). Quite independent of a person's nature or character, this expression refers to the body as a whole. Although Yahweh does not judge a person by this external appearance (cf. 1 S. 16:7; Job 10:4; Isa. 53, etc.), he can indeed punish a person's body for disobedience (Dt. 28:35; cf., e.g., Am. 4:10).

---

4. See II.2 below.
5. M. Dahood, *RSP*, I, 335, no. 511.
6. *HAL*, III, 983b.
7. → גלח *gillaḥ (gillach)*, III, 5-20.
8. See II.1 below.
9. → גלח *gillaḥ (gillach)*, III, 9-10.
10. G. R. Driver, "Hebrew Notes," *VT* 1 (1951) 241-50, here 241-42.
11. See III.2 below.
12. W. Rudolph, *Jeremia. HAT* I/12 (³1968), 19.

Ancient Near Eastern contracts, especially those of Esarhaddon, recall the Dtn/Dtr imprecations: "May Gula . . . [put] an unhealing sore in your body."[13] The expression *ultu qaqqadīya adi šēpēya,* "from the crown of my head to my feet," is attested in Akkadian parallels[14] so that one need not ascribe this motif exclusively to Dtr thinking.[15]

III. Idiomatic Expressions. The *qoḏqōḏ* represents both the highest and an extremely vulnerable part of the human body. Whatever befalls the "crown of the head" also befalls the person as a whole. In this regard, the OT uses several idioms also found in its surrounding cultures (cf. also the similar use of → רֹאשׁ *rō'š,* "head").

1. *"Come/Be upon a Person's Head."* Both good (Gen. 49:26, "abundant blessings," *birḵōṯ;* Dt. 33:16, "favor," *rāṣôn*[16]) and evil (Ps. 7:17[16], "violence," *ḥāmās* par. "mischief," *'āmāl*) can "come" or "be upon" a person's head, i.e., upon the entire person. While references to the "good" probably evoke the notion of the beneficent laying on of hands,[17] Yahweh's own intervention can cause misfortune to return to the head of the perpetrator like a cast stone (cf. Sir. 27:25-26).[18] In these contexts the OT uses *hāyâ lᵉ,* "be granted to," *bô' lᵉ,* "come upon," and *yāraḏ 'al,* "fall upon" (par. *šûḇ bᵉ,* "fall back upon").

2. *"Shatter a Person's Head."* The expression "smash a person's head in with a mace," SAG.GIŠ.RA, is a Sumerogram for Akk. *nêru,* "kill,"[19] and represents an expression for killing common throughout the ancient Near East, sometimes abbreviated to "shatter the skull."[20] Although the mace was hardly used as a weapon of war after the Middle Bronze Age, in both language and iconography it continued to represent the weapon of gods (esp. Syro-Mesopotamian) and kings (esp. Egyptian).[21]

The OT uses several verbs to refer to the "shattering" of a person's skull and thus of the whole person, including *mḥṣ,* "smite, beat, shatter" (after Jer. 2:16 cj. *yᵉro'ûḵ,* also *r''*, "break to pieces"[22]), metaphorically *'kl,* "devour," and *ṭrp,* "tear to pieces." The Song of Moses predicts it will happen to the east Jordanian adversaries of the "lion" Gad (Dt. 33:20). The fourth Balaam oracle (Nu. 24:17 cj.) anticipates it happening to the "sons of Seth," or Moabites, at the hands of David[23] (cf. 2 S. 8:2). The late (cf. LXX) oracle to the

---

13. *ANET,* 534a; cf. R. Frankena, "The Vassal-Treaties of Esarhaddon and the Dating of Deuteronomy," *OTS* 14 (1965) 122-54, esp. 146, 130.
14. EA 295:9-10; cf. *ARM,* X, 126:13-14; *HAL,* III, 1071b.
15. So W. Werner, *Eschatologische Texte in Jesaja 1–39. FzB* 46 (²1986), 122 on Isa. 1:6.
16. See, e.g., EA 326:18-19.
17. H. Gunkel, *Genesis* (Eng. trans. 1997), 461.
18. Idem, *Die Psalmen. HKAT* II/2 (⁵1968), 27; cf. esp. *WbÄS,* V, 531.
19. A. Falkenstein, *Sumerische Götterlieder. AHAW* (1959), I, 73.
20. In general: *CAD,* XIII, 102; *WbÄS,* V, 264, 12; 531, 2; *KTU* 1.2, IV, 21-22; 1:18, I, 11; IV, 22, etc.
21. *RLA,* V, 582-83; *LexÄg,* III, 414-15; *BRL*², 185, 103ff.; O. Keel, *Symbolism of the Biblical World* (Eng. trans. 1979), 291-306, ills. 394ff. (on thwarting enemies; with bibliog.).
22. See II.1 above.
23. K. Seybold, "Das Herrscherbild des Bileamorakels Num. 24,15-19," *TZ* 29 (1973) 1-19, esp. 4ff.

nations in Jer. 48:45 alludes to this last passage, calling the Moabites the "people of tumult." Finally, the hymn Ps. 68:22(21) anticipates Yahweh shattering the heads of his enemies, "those who walk in their guilty ways" *(miṯhallēḵ baʾᵃšāmāyw).*[24]

Schwab

---

24. See, e.g., EA 141:31, said of the king's enemies.

קָדַר qāḏar; קַדְרוּת qaḏrûṯ; קְדֹרַנִּית qᵉḏōrannîṯ

Contents: I. Etymology. II. OT Use. III. LXX, Qumran.

I. Etymology. Etymologically related terms include Jewish Aram. *qdr* peal and hithpael, "become dark";[1] Arab. *qaḏira/qaḏura,* "be/become dirty, unclean"; and Mand. *qdr* pael, "strike, blow, wound," panel, "be black."[2]

II. OT Use. The root *qdr* occurs 19 times in the OT. The verb occurs 17 times, including 13 in the qal, 3 in the hiphil, and once in the hithpael; the derivatives *qaḏrûṯ* and *qᵉḏōrannîṯ* occur once each. The root occurs only once in a narrative (1 K. 18:45), otherwise in "discursive" speech. The main meaning is "be dark, gloomy, dirty," whence it can shift to "mourn," the former meaning applicable primarily to the sky and stars (7 times), the latter to people (8 times).

After a drought, "the heavens grew black *(hiṯqaddᵉrû)* with clouds and wind" (1 K. 18:45). In connection with the "day of Yahweh" at the advance of the apocalyptic host against Jerusalem and at the final judgment of the nations, "the sun and moon are darkened *(qāḏārû)* and the stars withdraw their shining" (Joel 2:10b par. 4:15[3:15]). The judgment upon Pharaoh is accompanied by cosmic convulsions, as the prophet says in the name of Yahweh: "When I blot you out, I will cover the heavens, and make their stars dark *(wᵉhiqdartî);* I will cover the sun with a cloud, and the moon shall not give its light. All the shining lights of the heavens I will darken above you *(ʾaqdîrēm),* and put darkness on your land *(ḥōšeḵ)*" (Ezk. 32:7-8).[3] Isa. 50:3 also focuses on Yahweh's

---

qāḏar. L. Delekat, "Zum hebräischen Wörterbuch," *VT* 14 (1964) 7-66, esp. 55-56; J. Scharbert, *Der Schmerz im AT. BBB* 8 (1955), esp. 58-59.

1. *ANH,* 371.
2. *MdD,* 405.
3. Concerning the chiasmus *hiqdartî — ʾaqdîrēm,* see L. Boadt, "A:B:B:A Chiasm of Identical Roots in Ezekiel," *VT* 25 (1975) 696-97.

"grow dark, gloomy."[10] By contrast, Scharbert adduces the "unkempt appearance" and "neglect of personal grooming."[11] H.-J. Kraus suggests that the psalmist was blackened by the ashes of the penitential rite and had to wear the dusty clothes of a penitent.[12] Dalman similarly suspects that mourners dressed in dark clothing.[13]

The vocabulary associated with these 9 occurrences is fairly stereotypical, including 6 instances of the qal ptcp. of *qdr,* in 4 instances occurring with a form of *hlk.* Thus we read in the lament of the individual that "all day long I go around *(hillaḵtî)* mourning" (Ps. 38:7[6]); "Why must I walk about (*'ēlēḵ* or *'eṯhallēḵ*) mournfully?" (42:10b[9b] par. 43:2b); "bowed down *(šaḥôṯî)* and in mourning" (35:14). Job laments: "I go about *(hillaḵtî)* mournfully [NRSV 'in sunless gloom']" (30:28). In Mal. 3:14 the prophet cites the lament, "It is vain to serve God. What do we profit by keeping his command or by going about as mourners/with a mournful countenance *(hālaḵnû qᵉḏōrannîṯ)* before Yahweh of hosts?"[14] In Jer. 8:21 the prophet laments: "For the hurt of my poor people I am hurt, I mourn *(qāḏartî),* and dismay *(šammâ)* has taken hold of me." One hymnic section in Job praises God as the one who "sets on high those who are lowly, and those who mourn *(qōḏᵉrîm)* are lifted to safety" (5:11). Jer. 14:2 uses *qdr* metaphorically: "Because of the drought, Judah mourns *('āḇᵉlâ)* and her gates languish, they lie in gloom on the ground *(qāḏᵉrû).*"[15]

III. LXX, Qumran. The LXX renders *qdr* 4 times as *skythrōpázein* (see II above) and otherwise generally with derivatives of *skótos,* including *syskotázein* (1 K. 18:45; Jer. 4:28; Ezk. 32:7,8; Joel 2:10; 4:15[3:15]; Mic. 3:6), *skotoústhai* (see II above), and *skotízein* (Ezk. 31:15).

Only *qaḏrûṯ* occurs (once) in the Qumran texts. The suffering petitioner laments: "I am clothed in blackness and my tongue cleaves to the roof of my mouth" (1QH 5:31).

Schmoldt

10. Delekat, 55-56.
11. Scharbert, 59.
12. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59* (Eng. trans. 1988), 394.
13. *AuS,* V, 214.
14. Translation according to Rudolph, *Maleachi,* 285-86; and NRSV.
15. W. Rudolph, *Jeremia. HAT* I/12 (³1968), 98.

קדשׁ *qdš;* קֹדֶשׁ *qōḏeš;* קָדוֹשׁ *qāḏôš;* קָדֵשׁ *qāḏēš;* קְדֵשָׁה *qᵉḏēšâ;* מִקְדָּשׁ *miqdāš;* קֶדֶשׁ *qeḏeš*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology; 2. Extrabiblical Witnesses; 3. OT Word Field; 4. OT Derivatives. II. OT Use: 1. J; 2. E, D, Dtr History; 3. P; 4. Chronicler's History; 5. Isaiah; 6. Jeremiah; 7. Ezekiel; 8. Minor Prophets; 9. Psalms; 10. Wisdom; 11. Daniel; 12. Sirach. III. *qāḏēš, qᵉḏēšâ.* IV. LXX. V. Qumran.

---

qdš. M. C. Astour, "Tamar the Hierodule," *JBL* 85 (1966) 185-96; W. Baetke, *Das Heilige im Germanischen* (Tübingen, 1942); W. W. Baudissin, "Der Begriff der Heiligkeit im AT," *Studien zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte,* II (Leipzig, 1878), 1-142; G. Bettenzoli, *Geist der Heiligkeit: Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung des qdš-Begriffs im Buch Ezechiel. Quaderni di Semitistica* 8 (Florence, 1979); H. Bojorge, "Sed santos, porque santo soy yo Yavé vuestro Dios: De la naturaleza ética del culto," *RevBibl* 37 (1975) 223-34; U. Bunzel, *Der Begriff der Heiligkeit im AT* (Lauban, 1914); P. Burgelin, "La désacralisation," *RSR* 57 (1969) 503-18; R. Caillois, *L'homme et le sacré* (Paris, 1939); A. Caquot, "Le sacré dans l'AT," *Positions luthériennes* 28 (1980) 3-15; E. Castelli, ed., *Le sacré: Études et recherches* (Paris, 1974); idem, ed., *Prospettive sul sacro* (Padua, 1975); H. Cazelles, "Impur et sacré à Ugarit," *Al-Bahit. FS J. Henninger* (St. Augustin/Bonn, 1976), 37-47; idem, "Pur et impur aux origines de l'hébreu et à Ugarit," *MUSJ* 49 (1975/76) 443-49; H. Cazelles, et al., "Pureté et impureté," *DBS,* IX, 398-554; H. Cazelles, C.-B. Costecalde, and P. Grelot, "Sacré (et sainteté)," *DBS,* X, 1342-1483 (with bibliog.); C. Colpe, ed., *Die Diskussion um das "Heilige." WdF* 305 (1977); É. Cornélis, "Les formes du sacré," *RSR* 57 (1969) 481-502; C. B. Costecalde, "La racine *QDŠ* aux origines du sacré biblique" (diss., Paris, 1983); C. T. Craig, "Paradox of Holiness," *Int* 6 (1952) 147-61; B. Didier, *Le champ du sacré* (Paris, 1982); P. E. Dion, "Did Cultic Prostitution Fall into Oblivion During the Postexilic Era?" *CBQ* 43 (1981) 41-48; M. Douglas, *Purity and Danger* (London, 1966); A. Dumas, "Sacré," *Encyclopedia universalis,* XIV (1972), 579-81; M. Eliade, *The Sacred and the Profane* (Eng. trans. 1963); idem, *Patterns in Comparative Religion* (Eng. trans. 1963); J. Étienne, "L'homme et le sacré: Pour une clarification conceptuelle," *Revue théologique de Louvain* 13 (1982) 5-17; C. A. Evans, "An Interpretation of Isa 8,11-15 Unemended," *ZAW* 97 (1985) 112-13; A.-J. Festugière, *La sainteté* (Paris, 1942); E. J. Fisher, "Cultic Prostitution in the Ancient Near East? A Reassessment," *BTB* 6 (1976) 225-36; J. E. Fison, *Understanding the OT: The Way of Holiness* (1952; repr. Westport, 1979); A. Fridrichsen, *Hagios-Qadoš: Ein Beitrag zu den Voruntersuchungen zur christlichen Begriffsgeschichte* (Kristiania, 1916); H. S. Gehman, "Ἅγιος in the Septuagint, and Its Relation to the Hebrew Original," *VT* 4 (1954) 337-48; A. Gelin, "La sainteté de l'homme selon l'AT," *BVC* 19 (1957) 35-48; M. Gilbert, "Le sacré dans l'AT," in J. Ries, et al., eds., *L'expression du sacré dans les grandes religions,* I (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1978), 205-89; R. Girard, *Violence and the Sacred* (Eng. trans. 1988); M. I. Gruber, "Hebrew *qĕdēšāh* and Her Canaanite and Akkadian Cognates," *UF* 18 (1986) 133-48; idem, "The Qādēš in the Book of Kings and in Other Sources," *Tarbiz* 52 (1982/83) 162-76; A. de Guglielmo, "Sacrifice in the Ugaritic Texts," *CBQ* 17 (1955) 76-96; J. Hänel, *Die Religion der Heiligkeit* (Gütersloh, 1931); B. Häring, *Das Heilige und das Gute* (Krailling/Munich, 1950); R. Harris, "The Naditu Woman," *FS A. L. Oppenheim* (Chicago, 1964), 106-35; E. F. Harrison, "Holiness," *ISBE,* II, 725-29; G. F. Hasel, "The Identity of 'The Saints of the Most High' in Daniel 7," *Bibl* 56 (1975) 173-92, esp. 176-85, 190-92; H. Huppenbauer, "טהר und טהרה in der Sektenregel von Qumran," *TZ* 13 (1957) 350-51; W. Kornfeld, "Prostitution sacrée," *DBS,* VIII, 1356-74; idem, "*QDŠ* und Gottesrecht im AT," *Congress Volume, Vienna 1980. SVT* 32 (1981), 1-9; idem, "Reine und unreine Tiere im AT," *Kairos* 7 (1965) 134-47; H.-J. Kraus,

come clean, pure," D stem "cleanse, consecrate," developed as a result of euphonic metathesis *dš = šd;* adj. *qašdu(m),* "clean, pure, holy" (said of gods, the cult, sacrifices); *qašdūtu,* "*qašdatu/qadištu*-status"; *quššudu,* "most holy" (Middle Babylonian/Assyrian for *quddušu,* said of temples, sacrifices); cf. also *qu-da-šu(m)* (Old Akkadian), *qu-da-še-e* (Southern Babylonian), and the fem. PN *qu-da-šu* (in the sense of "not tainted, radiant, clear, transparent," jewelry, earring?).[14]

The derivatives just mentioned are found almost without exception in religious-cultic contexts where they qualify objects, places, and persons that as a prerequisite have been "cleansed, purified" and thus "consecrated," i.e., dedicated to the deity, and are now to be placed in a more intimate relationship with that deity. The term *quddušu* is often associated with the two words for "clean, pure," *ellu* and *ebbu.*[15]

The class of women known as *qadištu* emerged in the 2d millennium, was generally associated with cultic prostitution,[16] and existed alongside the other two classes of women, the *kulmašītu* and *nadītu,* to the middle of the 1st millennium. The Code of Hammurabi mentions these three classes of women, all of whom were dedicated to the temple cult and probably performed similar service.[17] Their respected social status gradually diminished, and by the Neo-Babylonian period the name came to refer to simple street prostitutes.[18] Even though their activity as sacred prostitutes is only assumed and has not been demonstrated textually,[19] it is certain that they were dedicated to Ishtar (Sum. Inanna), the goddess of love and fertility who bore the epithet *qadištu*[20] and as such was consecrated to the gods.

b. *Ugaritic.* Although the tablets constituting the Ugaritic witnesses[21] are often damaged and thus difficult to read, and although one cannot always be certain whether *qdš* is intended as an adjective or as an abstract substantive,[22] all the *qdš* derivatives occur without question in religious contexts, including ritual instructions and mythological texts. The term *qdš* is used to describe the gods themselves as well as everything associated more intimately with them, belonging to them in nature, or consecrated and thus associated with them by human beings.

The expression *qdš-w-'mrr* either refers to a pair of gods or applies both attributes to one and the same deity and can be translated "holy and exalted."[23] Keret is described as *šph ltpn wqdš,* "offspring of the Kindly One and [of the fem.?] holy being," with *qdš*

---

14. Concerning the metathesis see *GaG,* §36b; overall *AHw,* II, 906, 925, 930.
15. → טהר *ṭāhar* V, 289-90.
16. See Kornfeld, "Prostitution"; Astour; Yamauchi.
17. CH §181; *ANET,* 174.
18. Cf. *BWL,* 102-3; Harris, 107 n. 17; Renger, 183.
19. See Fisher, 229.
20. Römer, 150.
21. Enumerated in Costecalde, 1373.
22. Xella, 13.
23. *KTU* 1.4, IV, 2, 3, 8, 13; *ANET,* 133a, ll. 2, 8, 13, 16-17; R. Dussaud, *RHR* 105 (1932) 283-89, advocates a reference to a divine pair; U. Cassuto, *Biblical and Oriental Studies,* 2 vols. (Eng. trans. 1973-75), II, 182-83, advocates assigning both attributes to a single god (also trans.).

representing either an attribute of a god or the name of a goddess.[24] The expression *bn qdš* refers primarily to members of the heavenly assembly and can be translated as "son of holiness," "son of the gods," or simply "gods," "holy ones."[25] The expression *bn qdšt* probably means "son of the goddess *qadšt*" rather than "son of a consecrated one" (Bab. *qadištu*), since sacred prostitution has not yet been attested in Ugarit.[26] Personnel lists refer to *qdš(m)*, "consecrated ones,"[27] often together with *khnm*, "priests," but without indicating their concrete function. Nothing in the text suggests that they might, in analogy to Assyr.-Bab. *qadištu*, refer to male cult prostitutes.[28] The term *qdšm* refers to a priestly class, more specifically to the cultic servants supporting the priests in the temple.[29] The verb forms *nšqdš* and *tqd(š)* (cj.) occur in a ritual text and refer to the consecration of a sacrificial animal before its actual sacrifice.[30]

The term *qdš* describes Ba'al's voice, i.e., thunder as an expression of divine power (cf. Ps. 18:14[Eng. 13]; 29:3-5); it also describes the cup, *ks qdš*, reserved for the gods, and the citadel, *ḥlm qdš*. It occurs in synonymous parallelism with Ba'al's mount as the dwelling place of the deity, and can describe the steppe, *mdbr qdš*, where the divine children temporarily stop, and the wilderness of Kadesh. Finally *qdš* frequently refers to a sanctuary, the locus of encounter between gods and human beings, often as the preformative construction *mqdšt*.[31]

c. *West Semitic Inscriptions*. In West Semitic inscriptions *qdš* as a verb means "consecrate" (yiphil, pael, aphel) or "consecrate oneself" (hithpael), though not "clean, purify" as in Akkadian texts. One consecrated oneself to the deity (e.g., Punic, to *b'l 'dr*), animals (e.g., Phoenician, to *mlqrt*), or objects (e.g., an altar to *'nt*).[32] One could also, however, consecrate or dedicate things to other persons, particularly graves to descendants.[33] In these cases the act of consecration followed the final preparation of the grave or the act of dedication, and whatever was consecrated then belonged exclusively to the deity or to the persons designated by the celebrant.

The ptcp. *mqdšyn*, "consecrated, sanctified" (Palmyr. pael abs. masc. pl. pass. ptcp.) is used in connection with a grave complex dedicated to the descendants of the person

24. *KTU* 1.16, I, 10-11, 21-22; II, 48-49; *ANET*, 147a, KRT C, ll. 10-11, 21-22; 148a, ll. 111-12; Xella, 13; *TO*, I, 419.

25. *KTU* 1.2, I, 21, 38; III, 19-20; *ANET*, 130, ll. 21, 38.

26. *KTU* 4.69, V, 11; 4.412, I, 11; 1.81, 17; *WUS*, no. 2397; de Tarragon, 139-40.

27. *KTU* 4.36, 2; 4.38, 2; 4.68, 73; 4.126, 7.

28. Suggested by D. Urie, "Officials of the Cult at Ugarit," *PEQ* 80 (1948) 43; A. F. Rainey, "The Kingdom of Ugarit," *BA* 28 (1965) 124; objections from von Soden, *UF* 2, 329-30; Yamauchi, 219.

29. T. Yamashita, *RSP*, II, 67, no. 34; C. H. Gordon, *Ugarit and Minoan Crete* (New York, 1966), 18; Xella, 112; idem, review of J.-M. de Tarragon, *Le culte à Ugarit d'après les textes de la pratique en cunéiformes alphabetiques* (Paris, 1980), *UF* 13 (1981) 331; *WUS*, no. 2393.

30. *KTU* 1.119, 30; cj. *KTU* 1.161, 30; Xella, 10; de Tarragon, 73-74.

31. *KTU* 1.4, VII, 29-30, 31-32 (Ba'al's voice); also C. J. Labuschagne, "קוֹל *qôl* voice," *TLOT*, III, 1135-36; *KTU* 1.3, I, 13 (cup); *KTU* 1.16, I, 7; II, 46 (citadel); 1.23, 65 (steppe); also J. Aistleitner, "Götterzeugung in Ugarit und Dilmun," *Acta Orientalia Hungarica* 3 (1953) 295-311; R. Dussaud, *RHR* 108 (1933) 14-15 (Qadesh); *KTU* 4.609, 15 (sanctuary).

32. *DNSI*, II, 993-94.

33. See Palmyrene, *DNSI*, II, 993.

S. Morenz views Egyp. *dśr* as a term corresponding to Sem. *qdš* and believes that the basic meaning is "set apart."[50] The word also occurs in *tꜣ ḏśr* in reference to a cemetery, meaning not "splendid land" but rather "land that has been set apart." It is often used together with *štꜣ*, "secret," and *ỉmn*, "hidden." A priest can be "hidden" or "concealed" with reference to his inner disposition and *ḏśr* toward what he has seen; i.e., he keeps it to himself. Although the study of J. K. Hoffmeier seems to confirm this meaning,[51] other semantic nuances resonate in *ḏśr* as well, and the word seems to have been used in a much more restricted fashion than was *qdš*.

Ringgren

3. *OT Word Field.* Although *qdš* has no synonyms, it is related to → טהר *ṭāhar*, since being "consecrated" or "sanctified" does presuppose a condition of cultic acceptability and purity as also expressed by the metaphorical use of → כבס *kāḇas*. A similar conceptual relationship obtains with → נזר *nzr*, leading to the occasional or even frequent LXX rendering of *ṭhr* and *nzr* with ἁγι-/ἁγνι *(hagi-/hagni-)* constructions. Just as *qōḏeš/ḥōl*[52] and *ṭāhōr/ṭāmēʾ* (טהר *ṭhr*, טמא *ṭmʾ*) are contrasting terms (Lev. 10:10; Ezk. 22:26; 44:23), so also does → חָרַם *ḥāram* constitute the contrasting sphere to *qdš* in the sense of consecrating something to Yahweh for destruction.[53]

Müller lists the distribution of the 842 occurrences of the Heb. root *qdš* in the OT.[54] Significant concentrations are found in the books of Leviticus (152), Ezekiel (105), and Exodus (102), followed by Numbers (80), Isaiah (73), and Psalms (65). It occurs 48 times in the Dtr History but then 120 times in the Chronicler's History, including 60 in 2 Chronicles alone. The root does not occur in Nahum, Ruth, Canticles, and Esther. Strikingly, Jeremiah does not use the root very often (only 19 times), nor does wisdom literature at large (5 in Job, 3 in Proverbs, 1 in Ecclesiastes). The Aram. *qaddîš*, "holy, sacred," occurs 13 times, but only in the Aramaic portions of Daniel.

4. *OT Derivatives.* The following derivatives of *qdš* occur in the OT:

a. *qdš qal.* The stative verb *qdš* qal perfect designates the status of present or future consecration, and the imperfect the act of being consecrated valid for both the present and future (no ethical connotations). The following can be "consecrated": priests and their vestments (Ex. 29:21); everything that comes into contact with the altar, the cultic utensils, and any sacrificial material (Ex. 29:37; 30:29; Lev. 6:11,20[18,27]); the produce designated for the sanctuary (Dt. 22:9); arm bearers in holy war (1 S. 21:6[5]).

b. *qdš niphal.* God is the only subject in the niphal. He "shows himself to be holy" by manifesting his unchangeable divine holiness before Israel (Ex. 29:43) and the nations (Ezk. 20:41; 28:22,25; 36:23; 38:16; 39:27).

---

50. S. Morenz, *Egyptian Religion* (Eng. trans. 1973), 99-100.

51. J. K. Hoffmeier, *The Sacred in the Vocabulary of Ancient Egypt. OBO* 59 (1985).

52. → חלל *ḥll* (I), IV, 409-17.

53. Concerning *miqdāš*, "sanctuary," see also → אהל *ʾōhel*, I, 118-30; → בית *bayiṯ (bayith)*, II, 107-16; → כסא *kissēʾ*, VII, 232-59; → מעון *māʿôn*, VIII, 449-52; → מקום *māqôm*, VII, 532-44; → משכן *miškān*, IX, 58-64.

54. Müller, 1106-7.

c. *qdš piel.* In the piel *qdš* refers first of all in a factitive manner to the generation of the condition described in the qal, "bring something/someone into the condition of holiness/consecration according to the cultic regulations." It then also refers to "declaring something/someone holy" (the sabbath, Gen. 2:3; Ex. 20:11). Finally, in an estimative sense it refers to "considering/viewing something/someone as holy" (the sabbath, Jer. 17:22,24,27).

d. *qdš pual.* The pual is passive to the factitive in the sense of "be made holy; be holy/consecrated" (Ezr. 3:5).

e. *qdš hithpael.* The hithpael is reflexive to the piel. One sanctifies or consecrates oneself (Ex. 19:22; Lev. 11:44; 20:7). God "shows himself to be holy" (as in the niphal, Ezk. 38:23). One brings oneself into the condition of consecration or cultic purity (even without any mention of the particular ritual; cf. Nu. 11:18; Josh. 3:5; 7:13; 1 S. 16:5) or "is sanctified" (NRSV "keeping themselves holy," 2 Ch. 31:18).[55]

f. *qdš hiphil.* In the hiphil *qdš* means causatively to "make holy, consecrate, offer, surrender to God as a possession" (Josh. 20:7; 1 Ch. 23:13; 2 Ch. 29:19; 30:17). God can declare something or someone to be consecrated to him (Nu. 3:13; 1 K. 9:7). One can "view something/someone as holy" (Nu. 20:12; 27:14; Isa. 29:23).[56]

g. *qāḏôš.* The adj. *qāḏôš* is formed like the adjectives of verbs of condition (cf. *gāḏôl, ṭāhôr, qāṭōn*). It qualifies ritually significant places *(māqôm),* the camp *(maḥᵃneh),* the people of Israel, its priests, Levites, and believers, as well as God himself (cf. *qāḏôš ʾᵃnî,* Lev. 11:44-45), as whose epithet the nominalized adjective functions (*qᵉḏôš yiśrāʾēl,* 32 times, including 25 in Isaiah). The term *qāḏôš* is not used in connection with sacrifices, clothing, or utensils.

h. *qōḏeš.* The abstract noun *qōḏeš,* "holiness," is the most frequently occurring derivative of *qdš.* It often replaces the adjective as a genitive attribute (Lev. 19:8) or is used absolutely as an adjective (10:10) or predicatively with *hyh* (19:24). Secondarily the abstract noun can become a concrete designation for "sanctuary" (Ezk. 41:21) and finally for anything touched by holiness, including the gradation *qōḏeš (haq)qoḏāšîm,* "most holy" (Nu. 4:4; Lev. 21:22).

i. *qāḏēš/qᵉḏēšâ.* The nominalized adj. *qāḏēš* (masc.)/*qᵉḏēšâ* (fem.), "consecrated one" (cf. Akk. *qaššum/qadištu[m]*),[57] refers to male and female cult functionaries familiar from Canaanite cults, whence they were incorporated and imitated in syncretistic rituals in Israel.

j. *Place-Names.* A temple or sanctuary might prompt the emergence of *qāḏēš* and the dialectical variant *qeḏeš* in place-names (cf. Gen. 16:14;[58] Josh. 12:22; 20:7; Jgs. 4:6).

---

55. Concerning the passive sense of the hithpael, see *GK,* §25g; G. Bergsträsser, *Hebräische Grammatik,* II (1929; repr. Darmstadt, 1985), §18b.

56. See *HP,* 41, 59-60.

57. *AHw,* II, 891.

58. V. Fritz, M. Görg, and H. F. Fuhs, "Kadesch Barnea — Topographie und Siedlungsgeschichte im Bereich der Quellen von Kadesch und der Kultstätten des Negeb während der Königszeit," *BN* 9 (1979) 45-70.

3. *P.* P uses *qdš* primarily in the cultic sense and especially in connection with the sanctuary, cultic utensils, priests, and sacrifices, developing in the process an impressive theology of the sanctuary regulating virtually everything associated with it. The most fundamental stipulation is that "you must distinguish between the holy and the common *(ḥōl),* and between the unclean and the clean." This contrast with *ḥll* also emerges in the prohibitions against "desecrating" or "profaning" the holy gifts (Nu. 18:32, *qōḏeš;* cf. Lev. 22:15, H; concerning sacrifice, cf. Lev. 19:8; the sabbath, Ex. 31:14; the sanctuary, Lev. 21:12,23).

Moses is told to build a sanctuary *(miqdāš)* in which Yahweh can dwell (*škn;* Ex. 25:8); the sanctuary is thenceforth called a *miškān* (v. 9, then 56 times in the ensuing discussion) and only in isolated instances *qōḏeš* (28:29,35,43; 29:30; 35:19; 39:41, said of the priests' service in the sanctuary). It is there that Yahweh will reveal himself (*y'd* niphal) and manifest his *kāḇôḏ* (*qdš* niphal, 29:43). The texts allow for various degrees of holiness in this tabernacle. A curtain is to separate *qōḏeš,* the holy, from *qōḏeš qoḏāšîm,* the most holy, where the ark is located (26:33-34). After its completion the tent is anointed and consecrated (40:9).

The sacrificial laws mention a "sacred place" (*māqôm qāḏôš* or *m*ᵉ*qôm qōḏeš,* Lev. 10:17; 14:13) in the forecourt of the tent of meeting (Lev. 6:9,19[16,26]) "beside the altar" (10:12-13)[78] where sacrifices are prepared (Ex. 29:31) or eaten (Lev. 6:9,19[16,26]; 7:6; 10:13; cf. 24:9, H). The altar is to be anointed and consecrated *(qdš),* making it *qōḏeš qoḏāšîm,* "most holy." Anyone who touches it becomes holy (Ex. 29:36-37; 40:9; cf. Lev. 8:10; Nu. 7:1). The holy itself is contagious, prompting caution in dealing with it; anyone approaching too close to the most holy will die (Nu. 4:19-20). Cultic utensils as well as priestly clothing also participate in such holiness.

Similar to the sanctuary, so also are the priests to be consecrated. According to Ex. 28:41, Aaron and his sons are to be anointed and consecrated (*qdš* piel) in order to perform priestly service (cf. Ex. 28:3; Lev. 8:12, said of Aaron; Ex. 29:1,33,44; 30:30; Lev. 8:30; 21:8, said of the priests). The high priest's turban bears a rosette[79] with the inscription *qōḏeš l*ᵉ*yhwh* (Ex. 28:36). The holy office of the priests demands special cautionary measures as explicated especially in Lev. 21:1-22. One paramount consideration is that "they shall be holy to their God," *qāḏôš l*ᵉ, where *qāḏôš* functions as a relational term (cf. Lev. 20:26; Nu. 6:5,8; 15:40); "they shall not profane the name of their God *(ḥillēl),* for they offer . . . the food of their God; therefore they shall be holy *(qōḏeš)*" (Lev. 21:6). Whence also the community should treat the priests as holy (*qdš* piel), "they shall be holy *(qāḏôš)* to you; for I, Yahweh, I who sanctify you *(m*ᵉ*qaddēš),* am holy *(qāḏôš)*" (v. 8; cf. also v. 15; 22:2). The priests thus stand in a special relationship with Yahweh and as such belong to the divine sphere itself, a situation imposing on them the obligation to maintain cultic purity and enjoining the congregation to accord them special respect. This holiness is then extended to the cultic utensils, a principle confirmed in connection with the revolt of Korah: "All the congregation *(qāhāl)* are

---

78. M. Haran, *Temples and Temple-Service in Ancient Israel* (Oxford, 1978), 185.
79. → ציץ *ṣîṣ.*

only Neh. 8:11 without *lᵉ*, "Be quiet, for this day is holy"). The temple is always *miqdāš* (1 Ch. 22:19; 28:10; 2 Ch. 20:8; 26:18; 29:21; 30:8; 36:17). The Chronicler uses both the piel and the hiphil to denote the consecration of the temple and sacred objects (piel in 2 Ch. 7:7 [forecourt]; 29:5; 29:17; Neh. 3:1 [towers]; hiphil in 1 Ch. 18:11 [vessels]; 2 Ch. 2:3; 7:16; 29:19 [vessels]), the hiphil also for the transference of gifts to Yahweh (1 Ch. 26:26-28; Neh. 12:47; cf. pual 2 Ch. 31:6), for priestly consecration (1 Ch. 23:13, the result being the status of *qōḏeš qoḏāšîm*), for the Levitical sanctification of the congregation (2 Ch. 30:17), and with Yahweh as the subject with reference to the temple (2 Ch. 7:20; 30:8; 36:14). The piel is used once in reference to the sabbath (Neh. 13:22). The hithpael refers either to the preparation of priests for holy service (1 Ch. 15:12,14; 2 Ch. 5:11; 29:5,15,34; 30:3,15,24) or of the people for the Passover celebration (2 Ch. 30:17; 35:6). 2 Ch. 31:18 uses a *figura etymologica* with the expression *hiṯqaddēš qōḏeš* in recounting how Hezekiah enrolls priests and Levites along with the children who were sanctified with their fathers.

The term *qōḏeš* underwent a special development in that it came to refer to the temple as the sanctuary (2 Ch. 5:11; 29:5,7; 35:5; probably also 1 Ch. 23:32, *mišmereṯ haqqōḏeš;* 2 Ch. 30:19, the "sanctuary's rules of cleanness"). The most holy place in the temple is called *qōḏeš qoḏāšîm* (1 Ch. 6:34[49]; 2 Ch. 3:8,10; 4:22; 5:7); the same expression refers to the most holy gifts or sacrifices (2 Ch. 31:14; Ezr. 2:63; Neh. 7:65) and to the consecrated priests (hiphil, 1 Ch. 23:13). The term *qōḏeš* is also used adjectively to refer to something holy. Because the priests and Levites are *qōḏeš,* they are allowed to enter the sanctuary (2 Ch. 23:6). Priests are entrusted with cleansing "all that is holy" (1 Ch. 23:28). Both priests and utensils are *qōḏeš* (Ezr. 8:28), as is David's palace (here: "consecrated") because of the presence of the ark (2 Ch. 8:11). Sacrifices, holy gifts, and the tithe are *qōḏeš* or even *qōḏeš qoḏāšîm* (1 Ch. 26:20,26; 28:12; 2 Ch. 5:1; 15:18; 29:33; 31:6; cf. 35:13, Passover lamb; 24:7, used for the Ba'als). One frequent expression is *kᵉlê qōḏeš,* "holy utensils" (1 Ch. 9:29; 22:19; 2 Ch. 5:5). Other construct expressions include *mᵉ'ôn qoḏšô,* God's "holy dwelling in heaven" (2 Ch. 30:27); *'ᵃrôn haqqōḏeš,* "the holy ark" (2 Ch. 35:3); *mᵉqôm qōḏeš,* "a holy place" (Ezr. 9:8); *šēm qoḏšô,* "his holy name" (1 Ch. 29:16), *'îr haqqōḏeš,* "the holy city" (Neh. 11:1,18), *yôm qōḏeš,* "holy day, festival day" (Neh. 9:14; 10:32,34[31,33]). The expression *haḏraṯ qōḏeš,* "holy adornment/array(?)" (2 Ch. 20:21), derives from the language of the Psalms. Ezr. 9:2 is of particular importance in its assertion that the "holy seed *(zera' haqqōḏeš)* has mixed itself with the people of the lands," implying that the Israelites as a holy people should not mix with pagans.

5. *Isaiah.* a. The term *qāḏôš* becomes a key word in the book of Isaiah in part through the trisagion (6:3) and in part through the divine epithet *qᵉḏôš yiśrā'ēl,* "Holy One of Israel," found largely in Proto- and Deutero-Isaiah (only 5 times outside Isaiah: Jeremiah, Psalms).

In his call vision Isaiah hears the seraphim extol Yahweh as the thrice-holy one. Here God is "King Yahweh of hosts" (v. 5) whose *kāḇôḏ* fills the entire earth (v. 3). Yahweh is the terrifying God who fills Isaiah with the feeling of inadequacy and uncleanness. This uncleanness (v. 5), however, does not seem to be understood cultically,

since the ensuing cleansing actually consists in a forgiveness of sins (v. 7). Here the reader seems to be closer than elsewhere in the OT to an ethical determination of holiness. The seraphim's words are probably a cultically fixed formula (cf. Ps. 99, which uses *qāḏôš* 3 times together with the royal motif). The divine epithet *qᵉḏôš yiśrā'ēl* occurs 13 times in Proto-Isaiah, 10 times in Deutero-Isaiah, and twice in Trito-Isaiah (cf. also 10:17, "his holy one"; 43:15, "your holy one"; and 29:23, "holy one of Jacob"). This epithet is frequently used especially when the issue is a violation of the divine majesty as in 1:4: "They have forsaken Yahweh, have despised the Holy One of Israel" (cf. 5:24; 31:1; 37:23; also 5:19; 30:11-12).[84] The Holy One of Israel is the majestic God against whom no one can rebel without incurring punishment (5:24). He, Israel's light, becomes a fire, the Holy One a flame that "will burn and devour" his enemies (10:17). His name should be kept holy (hiphil); people "will stand in awe of the God of Israel" (29:23; cf. also 8:13). The Holy One is a terrifying God. (In 8:14 one should read *maqšîr* instead of *miqdāš*.) The Holy One of Israel, however, is also the Creator in whom one has confidence (17:7). The remnant will lean on him (10:20) and the poor will exult in him (29:19; cf. 12:6). It is he who says, "in returning and rest you shall be saved; in quietness and in trust shall be your strength" (30:15). The holy God is thus also the helping God.

The expression "the Holy God shows himself holy (niphal) by righteousness" refers to God's function as judge (5:16), before whom according to v. 15 the "eyes of the haughty are humbled."

Only once does *qāḏôš* refer to people. "Whoever is left in Zion and remains in Jerusalem will be called holy" (4:3), a statement probably referring to the sacrosanct, untouchable status (Procksch, Bentzen) of the remnant rather than to their purification through judgment (Kaiser).

In one passage *miqdāš* is used in connection with Moab, which enters its sanctuary to pray and yet accomplishes nothing (16:12; see previous discussion of 8:14).

Isa. 30:29 speaks of the miraculous night in which a *ḥag* is sanctified (hithpael). Cultic joy becomes a metaphor for redemption.

The occurrences of *qōḏeš* in Isaiah exhibit a striking concentration in Trito-Isaiah, which otherwise uses *qdš* rather sparingly. The expression does, however, occur in the first part of the book with a reference to the *har qoḏšî* in 11:9; during the coming salvific age, no one will "hurt or destroy" on Yahweh's holy mountain. Isa. 27:13 anticipates the day when the dispersed will return to Jerusalem "and worship Yahweh on the holy mountain." According to 23:18, in the future all the merchandise and wages of Tyre will be *qōḏeš lᵉyhwh*, i.e., will be forfeited to him. The addendum to ch. 6 speaks of the small remnant as the "holy seed" *(zera' qōḏeš)*, referring probably to its status as the beginning of a new people of God. Isa. 35:8 speaks of a highway through the wilderness called the "Holy Way" *(dereḵ qōḏeš)* upon which the unclean may not travel, referring probably to a highway leading to the sanctuary, a path on which no one will get lost.

---

84. Fridrichsen, 25.

b. The divine epithet *qᵉdôš yiśrāʾēl* is also of central importance for Deutero-Isaiah, who associates it first of all with the idea of creation. "Thus says Yahweh, the Holy One of Israel, and its Maker . . . I made the earth, and created humankind upon it" (45:11-12). "I am Yahweh, your Holy One, the Creator of Israel, your King" (43:15; concerning the royal motif, see the previous discussion of Isa. 6), the one who creates miraculous vegetation in the desert (41:20). In 54:5 he is both creator and redeemer *(gōʾēl)*, with the latter designation recurring in several other passages as well (41:14; 43:14; 47:4; 48:17; 49:7). As such he is the mighty God who smashes his enemies; when he bares his holy arm, "all the ends of the earth shall see the salvation of our God" (52:10).

The Holy One is incomparable (40:25). He is the lofty one who dwells on high and yet also among the contrite and humble in spirit (57:15). Israel will rejoice and glory in him (41:16). He glorifies his people Israel (*pʾr* piel, 55:5; 60:9). Isa. 52:11 summons the returnees to purify themselves and to avoid what is unclean, "you who carry the vessels of Yahweh." Strikingly, the word "holy" is not used in this passage.

The passages in Trito-Isaiah have a slightly different focus. The sabbath is called holy in 58:13, while 66:17 speaks of those who sanctify (hithpael) and purify themselves in preparation for pagan rites in gardens, and in 65:5 the idolaters say, "keep to yourself, do not come near me, for *qᵉdaštîḵā*," meaning perhaps, "I am (too?) holy for you."[85] In his cultic condition of holiness, he is dangerous to outsiders (others read piel, "I make you holy," i.e., holiness is contagious). Deutero-Isaiah twice refers to the "holy city" with which one associates oneself (48:2) and which should put on beautiful garments; the unclean "shall enter you no more" (52:1). In 43:28 the expression *śārê qōḏeš* might, in the fashion of 1 Ch. 24:5, refer to the priests (or to the last kings of Judah? the text is corrupt). In any event the verb *ḥillēl* fits well contextually in the sense of robbing the holy of their holiness.

Trito-Isaiah also mentions *har qoḏšî* several times (56:7; 57:13; 65:11,25; 66:20). Ch. 64 laments the miserable condition of the country itself. God's holy cities *(ʿārê qoḏšᵉḵā)* are desolate (v. 9[10]), and the holy temple *(bêṯ qoḏšēnû)* has been burned (v. 10[11]). Isa. 62:9 mentions the holy courts, while 58:13 speaks of the sabbath as the *yôm qoḏšî* and 62:12 of Israel as the *ʿam haqqōḏeš* or *ʿam qoḏšᵉḵā* (63:18). According to 63:15, heaven is God's holy habitation *(zᵉḇul qoḏšᵉḵā)* from which he looks down. One particularly noteworthy expression is *rûaḥ qoḏšô* in 63:10-11. Although God's holy spirit was at work during the deliverance from Egypt, the Israelites grieved him with their rebellion.

Two occurrences of *miqdāš* are also noteworthy. Even though God's enemies have trampled down his sanctuary (63:18), he will reestablish its beauty in the future (60:13).

In this sense, God's holiness constitutes a basic theme in the book of Isaiah. Most of the remaining occurrences of *qdš* follow the general use of this term elsewhere in the OT. Its use in Trito-Isaiah exhibits certain similarities with its use in the Chronicler's History.

---

85. *GK*, §117x.

6. *Jeremiah.* Surprisingly, the root *qdš* does not occur very often in the book of Jeremiah. Among these occurrences, the two involving *qᵉḏôš yiśrāʾēl* are doubtless secondary (oracle against Babylon, chs. 50–51). The first addresses the violation of holiness insofar as Babylon "has arrogantly defied Yahweh, the Holy One of Israel" (50:29). The second remarks positively that despite the people's own guilt, Yahweh has not forsaken them (51:5). The sabbath pericope in 17:19-27, which mentions keeping the sabbath holy in three verses (vv. 22,24,27), is probably secondary (or Dtr? cf. Holladay). Jer. 1:5 is unique in its assertion that Yahweh consecrated (hiphil) Jeremiah even before his birth, a statement apparently presupposing an office comparable to that of the priest. Three passages portray hostile attacks on Israel as acts of holy war (an expression otherwise explicitly associated with *qdš* only in 1 S. 21). "Sanctify (piel) a war against Zion" (6:4); "I will consecrate destroyers against you" (22:7); "consecrate the nations for war against her" (51:27,28). Rather than representing "archaic usage,"[86] this usage more likely ironically portrays Yahweh's punishment as a holy war.[87] Jer. 12:3 also uses *hiqdîš* figuratively. Jeremiah asks Yahweh to "consecrate" his enemies "for the day of slaughter," i.e., just as one consecrates sacrificial animals. Expressions such as *mᵉʿôn qoḏšô* (par. "on high," 25:30) and *har qōḏeš* (31:23) are more traditional. In the latter passage, the equivalency with *nᵉwēh ṣeḏeq* is noteworthy.

According to Jer. 2:3, Israel itself is *qōḏeš lᵉyhwh* and is the firstfruits of his harvest; the verse goes on to explicate that "all who ate of it were held guilty," again invoking a metaphor from the cultic sphere. The sacredness *(qōḏeš lᵉ)* of the rebuilt Jerusalem is also considered indestructible (31:40). Although the expression *bᵉśar qōḏeš* in 11:15 seems to refer to "sacred meat," i.e., sacrificial meat, the text is probably corrupt. Jer. 23:9 recounts how Yahweh's holy words overcame the prophet.

In the temple sermon (ch. 7; cf. ch. 26), the temple is merely called *bêṯ yhwh.* By contrast, 17:12 speaks of the *mᵉqôm miqdāšēnû,* and 51:51 (secondary) of the *miqdᵉšê bêṯ yhwh,* a reference probably to the various edifices in the temple.

7. *Ezekiel.* A quite specific aspect of the holy emerges in Ezekiel. Yahweh's holy name has been profaned *(ḥll)* because his people Israel have been dispersed among the nations. The nations thus say, "These are the people of Yahweh, and yet they had to go out of his land" (36:20-21). For the sake of his holy name, however, he will rescue his people and lead them back to his land, thereby sanctifying his name again, "and the nations shall know that I am Yahweh when through you I display my holiness before their eyes" (niphal; 36:22-24). Profaning Yahweh's holy name is equivalent to denying his power. He shows himself holy by establishing his power and glory. In this sense *hiṯqaddēš* and *hiṯgaddēl* are parallel: "So I will display my greatness and my holiness [through victory over Gog]" (38:23; cf. v. 16). Victory over their enemies and the gathering in of the dispersed people demonstrate Yahweh's holiness to the nations (20:41;

---

86. So W. Rudolph, *Jeremia. HAT* I/12 (³1968), 42 on 6:4.

87. See J. A. Soggin, "Der prophetische Gedanke über den heiligen Krieg, als Gericht gegen Israel," *VT* 10 (1960) 81.

28:25) and lead to an acknowledgment of his status as Yahweh and of his ability to impose his will and fulfill his promises (20:41-42; 28:22; 36:23; 38:23; cf. 39:7).

Ezk. 28:22 parallels *niqdaštî* and *nikbadtî*, recalling the association of *qādôš* and *kābôd* in Isa. 6. In Ezk. 39:25 God says, "I will be jealous *(qn')* for my holy name," recalling the reference in Josh. 24:19 to Yahweh as a "holy and jealous God."

Ezekiel's interest in priests and the cult emerges not only in the draft constitution (chs. 40–48), but also in his objection that the priests "have made no distinction between the holy and the common" (*qōdeš, ḥōl,* 22:26; cf. 44:23, as the priestly obligation). The idolaters have defiled the sanctuary *(miqdāš)* and desecrated it (5:11; 23:38-39; cf. 7:24; 8:6; 25:3). Indeed, Yahweh himself will profane his own sanctuary (24:21). On the other hand, Yahweh can act as a sanctuary for the exiles (11:16), and once his sanctuary again stands in Israel the nations will see that it is Yahweh who sanctifies Israel (37:26,28). Ezk. 28:18 even mentions the profanation of the Tyrian sanctuaries.

The occurrences of *miqdāš* and *qōdeš* increase in the description of the new temple, the former generally functioning as the usual word for "temple" itself (43:21; 44:1,5,7-9,11,15-16; 45:3-4,18; 47:12; 48:8,10,21), though *qōdeš* can function similarly (42:14; 44:27). Oddly the altar is described not as "sanctified" but as "cleansed" (43:26; cf. 43:7-8, "defile my holy name"). In the temple itself, the "most holy place" is again *qōdeš qodāšîm* (41:4), though also simply *qōdeš* (41:21,23). The *miqdāš* is said to be located in a holy district within the land (45:1,4) and is called "most holy." The temple is surrounded by a wall separating the holy from the common (42:20). The regulations concerning the eating of the most holy offerings in a holy place (42:13) recall similar regulations in P. Levites who have engaged in idolatry are forbidden to approach the Holy One (44:13). Other expressions including *qōdeš* include *liškôt qōdeš,* "holy chambers" (42:13; 44:19; 46:19)[88] and *terûmat qōdeš,* "holy portion" (45:6-7; 48:10,18,20-21). In general, then, Ezekiel places great importance on the holiness of both the temple and cultic acts, and emphasizes more than other authors the importance of maintaining the distinction between the holy and the common or unclean.

8. *Minor Prophets.* The few occurrences of *qdš* in the Minor Prophets do not allow a characterization of the individual prophets. Amos calls any traffic with the *na'ᵃrâ* (cultic prostitution?) a desecration of Yahweh's holy name (2:7). In 4:2 Yahweh swears by his holiness (cf. Ps. 60:8[6]; 89:36[35]), recalling passages in which he swears by himself (Gen. 22:16; Isa. 45:23; Jer. 22:5; 49:13). God's holiness is what constitutes his divine being. Finally Amaziah calls the sanctuary at Bethel the king's *miqdāš* (7:13), and Amos predicts that Israel's own sanctuaries will be laid waste (7:9).

Hos. 11:9 draws attention to God's otherness. Israel's God will not vent his wrath because he is God and not a human being; he is the "Holy One in your midst." In 12:1 the expression *qᵉdôšîm* seems to be functioning as a divine epithet (constructed similar to *'ᵉlōhîm*); Judah remains faithful to the Holy One.

---

88. → לשכה *liškâ,* VIII, 33-38.

text of 46:5(4) is uncertain, the reference is in any case to Elyon's habitation on Zion. In 65:5(4) the *qᵉḏôš hêḵāleḵā* that parallels *ṭûḇ bêṯeḵā* is something with which one can satisfy oneself (perhaps a sacrificial meal?). In 106:16 Aaron is the "holy one of Yahweh," his consecrated priest.

Frequent expressions include *har qōḏeš (qoḏšî/ô),* the "holy mountain," as a reference to Zion (3:5[4]; 15:1; 43:3; 48:2[1]; 87:1; 99:9); the mount on which Yahweh dwells participates in his holiness. Other expressions include *hêḵal qôḏeš* (with suf.) in reference to the temple (5:8[7]; 11:4; 79:1; 138:2). The temple is *mᵉqôm qoḏšô* (24:3). It is unclear whether *mᵉʿôn qoḏšô* (68:6[5]) refers to heaven or to the temple, though *mᵉrôm qōḏeš* in 102:20(19) is in any event heaven, which in 20:7(6) is called *šᵉmê qoḏšô.* The parallelism suggests that when God sends help from the *qōḏeš,* he is actually sending it from the sanctuary on Zion (20:3[2]). The *dᵉḇîr qoḏšeḵā* in 28:2 is clearly the holy of holies. Yahweh sits on his holy throne in the temple (47:9[8]). Several passages refer to the sanctuary simply as *qōḏeš.* It is where God speaks (60:8[6]; 108:8[7]), where one sees (63:3[2]) and praises him (150:1), where one raises one's hands in prayer (134:2) and sees his processions (68:25[24]; v. 18[17] is possibly corrupt). Ps. 74:3 speaks of the devastation the enemy has wrought there (see v. 7 with *miqdāš*). Passages in which petitioners have experienced a resolution of their problems also use *miqdāš* to refer to the temple (68:36[35]; 96:6; 78:69; also 73:17 with *miqdᵉšê ʾēl,* with a similar solution to a problem).

God's *qōḏeš* is his essence, that by which he swears (89:36[35]; cf. above). His holy name *(šēm qoḏšô)* is the object of praise (33:21; 103:1; 105:3; 106:47; 145:21; cf. 30:5[4]; 97:12 with *zēḵer*). Reference is also made to *gᵉḇûl qoḏšô,* his holy hill (78:54), the holy oil (89:21[20]), God's holy word (of promise, 105:42), his holy arm (98:1), and his holy spirit, i.e., his divine power (51:13[11]). According to 114:2, Judah/Israel is God's *qōḏeš,* his dominion, and according to 77:14(13) God's *dereḵ* is in the *qōḏeš,* contextually a reference to God's greatness and his miraculous works (manifest or revealed perhaps in the sanctuary?). Finally, *qōḏeš,* "holiness," befits Yahweh's house (93:5).

Hence the Psalms focus on God's own holiness and on his presence in the sanctuary.

10. *Wisdom.* Not surprisingly, wisdom authors do not use the term *qdš* frequently. In two instances *daʿaṯ qᵉḏôšîm* refers simply to knowledge of God (Prov. 9:10; 30:3; cf. Hos. 12:1[11:12]). Prov. 20:25 warns against rashly declaring something to be *qōḏeš* (the parallelism suggests a reference to a vow). Job "sanctifies" his sons (1:5) with representative sacrifices (or is he inviting them to a sacrificial meal?). The holy ones Eliphaz mentions are apparently angels (5:1; cf. 15:15). Job mentions the words of the Holy One (God; 6:10). Although the text of Eccl. 8:10 is problematical, *māqôm* (instead of *mᵉqôm*) seems to refer to the holy place the righteous must leave without reason.

11. *Daniel.* In the Hebrew portions of the book of Daniel, *qōḏeš* refers in several instances to the sanctuary (8:13-14; 9:24,26); reference is also made to the "holy mountain" (9:16,20) and the "holy city" (9:24). The expression *ṣᵉḇî haqqōḏeš* also refers to the temple (11:45). The "holy covenant" is the covenant with God (11:28,30). Israel is

the "holy people" (12:7) or the "people of the holy ones" (8:24). By contrast, in 8:13 the "holy ones" are angels.

Only the form *qaddîš* occurs in the Aramaic portion, where several passages assert that the "spirit of the holy gods" is in Daniel (4:5,6,15[8,9,18]; 5:11). The angels are called "holy ones" (4:10,14,20[13,17,23]). Israel is also called the "holy ones of the Most High" (7:18,22,25,27) or simply the "holy ones" (7:21).

12. *Sirach.* Sirach's use of *qdš* generally concurs with the use in the Hebrew OT. God can be called simply the "Holy One" (23:9; 43:10; 48:20). Both the temple and its cultic utensils are holy (24:10; 26:17; 45:10,12,15; 49:12), as are the contributions (*t*^{e}*rûmâ*, 36:18; 49:6). The temple is *miqdāš* (45:24; cf. 47:13; 50:11). The service of wisdom is a holy (priestly) service (4:14). The angels who praise God are holy (42:17). Aaron is a holy man (45:6), and Elisha is filled with the holy spirit (48:12).

III. *qāḏēš, q*^{e}*ḏēšâ*. *Both qāḏēš* and *q*^{e}*ḏēšâ* must be understood as "consecrated one." Although the two terms are generally associated with cultic prostitution, none of the passages offers any unequivocal evidence of such.[89]

Dt. 23:18(17) prohibits the Israelites from becoming a *qāḏēš* or *q*^{e}*ḏēšâ*. This prohibition clearly involves cultic functions incommensurate with the Yahweh religion; although v. 19(18) possibly alludes to cultic prostitution in its reference to the wages of a prostitute, there is no clear indication that the two verses are substantively related. Four passages in the Dtr History associate the *q*^{e}*ḏēšîm* or collective *qāḏēš* with foreign cultic practices. According to 1 K. 15:12, Asa expelled the *q*^{e}*ḏēšîm* from the land and removed the *gillulîm*. 1 K. 14:23-24 enumerates *bāmôṯ, maṣṣēḇôṯ*, and *ʾ*^{a}*šērîm* "on every high hill and under every green tree," adding (collective) *qāḏēš* to the list and referring to it all as *tôʿ*^{a}*ḇôṯ*. 1 K. 22:46 says only that the remnant of the (collective) *qāḏēš* were exterminated. 2 K. 23:7 is more detailed. Josiah "broke down the houses of the *q*^{e}*ḏēšîm* in Yahweh's house, where the women wove *bāttîm* (material?) for Asherah." Job 36:14 attests only that *q*^{e}*ḏēšîm* was a derogatory term: Elihu says that the life of the wicked is like that of the *q*^{e}*ḏēšîm*.

Hos. 4:13-14 censures the Canaanite cult for sacrificing on the tops of mountains and making offerings on the hills under shady trees, then continues: "Therefore your daughters play the whore *(zānâ)*, and your daughters-in-law commit adultery *(nʾp)* . . . they [the priests] go aside with whores *(zônôṯ)* and sacrifice with *q*^{e}*ḏēšôṯ*; thus a people without understanding comes to ruin." Like Gen. 38:21-22, this passage equates the *q*^{e}*ḏēšâ* with the *zônâ*, though it still remains unclear whether they are considered identical or merely similar. It is worth noting that their activities are different. One "goes aside" with the *zônôṯ*, but sacrifices with the *q*^{e}*ḏēšôṯ*, attesting that the *q*^{e}*ḏēšôṯ* but not necessarily the *zônôṯ* performed certain cultic functions. J. Jeremias suggests a possible reference to bridal rituals.[90]

89. See B. M. Barstad, *The Religious Polemics of Amos*. *SVT* 34 (1984), 17-33; cf. Gruber.
90. J. Jeremias, *Der Prophet Hosea*. *ATD* 24/1 (1983), 70-71.

Extant witnesses do not allow one to draw any unequivocal conclusions regarding cultic prostitution in Israel. Such activity is not attested in Ugarit,[91] and the Greek witnesses for this custom are in part uncertain and perhaps locally restricted.[92] Moreover, passages such as Jer. 2:20,25; 3:2; 13:27 may be intended figuratively. One can say with certainty only that these "consecrated ones" represent a foreign cult.

Ringgren

IV. LXX. Although the LXX generally renders *qdš* derivatives with *hágios* and its derivatives, it also uses other terms. The following synopsis enumerates the translations:

qōḏeš (469 occurrences) = *hágios* (425), *hagíasma* (13), *hagiázein* (6), *hagiōsýnē* (2), other terms (19), not translated (4).

qāḏôš (116 occurrences) = *hágios* (107), *hagiázein* (4), other terms (3), not translated (2).

qāḏēš/qᵉḏēšâ (11 occurrences) = *pórnē* (6), *teletḗ* (1), transliterated (1 [2 K. 23:7]), other terms (2), not translated (1).

miqdāš (74 occurrences) = *hágios* (43), *hagíasma* (22), *hagiastḗrion* (3), *hēgiasménon* (2), *tá hierá* (1 [Ezk. 28:18]), *haí teletaí* (1 [Am. 7:9]), *tá cheiropoíēta* (1 [Isa. 16:12]), untranslated (1).

qāḏaš (172 occurrences) = *hagiázein* (140), *hagnízein* (19), other terms (13).[93]

The adj. *hágios* appears first in Herodotus (5.119; 2.41,44) and is probably related to the archaic verb *házomai*, "stand in awe of, dread," itself deriving from Sanskrit *yájati*, "honor with prayer and sacrifice."[94] During the Hellenistic period, *hágios* was used as an epithet especially for gods whose cults had been imported from the east;[95] but that it was never applied to a living human being means that expressions such as *éthnos hágion* (Ex. 19:6) or *laós hágios* (Dt. 7:6) were coined for the LXX. During the Homeric period, the adj. *hagnós*, which is related to *hágios*, also had a sacral meaning, though this meaning changed during the Ptolemaic period, when it came to mean "pure" (*hagneía*, "purity," *hagnízein*, "purify, cleanse"); so semantically *qāḏôš* is related to *ṭāhôr* the way *hágios* is related to *hagnós*, though the rendering of *qāḏaš* as *hagnízein* (19 times, 15 in Chronicles) shows that, as before, authors were aware of the kinship between *hágios* and *hagnós* and thus also closely associated "(ritual) purity" (generally translated as *katharós*) with "holiness." In the LXX the adj. *hierós*, which during the classical and Hellenistic periods was the regnant one, now refers only to the temple (cf. *hierón* for *bayiṯ* in 1 Ch. 9:27; 29:4; for *ʿᵃzārâ* in 2 Ch.

---

91. See I.2.b above.

92. Herodotus 1.199 for Babylon; Lucian for Syria; also Strabo; see Barstad, *Religious Polemics*, 24ff.

93. Concerning these terms, cf. O. Procksch and K. G. Kuhn, "ἅγιος," *TDNT*, I, 88-115; F. Hauck, "ἁγνός," *TDNT*, I, 122-24; G. Schrenk, "ἱερός/ἱερόν," *TDNT*, III, 221-83; F. Hauck and R. Meyer, "καθαρός," *TDNT*, III, 418-31; F. Hauck, "ὅσιος," *TDNT*, V, 489-93.

94. P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*, I (Paris, 1968), 25-26.

95. See Fridrichsen, 30.

6:13, but only Ezk. 28:18 for the *qdš* derivative *miqdāš*). The reason for the different usage may well have been an altered understanding of holiness itself. The OT understanding of holiness was based on the historical proximity of the holy God who made Israel into a "holy people" in fellowship with him. Hence for semantic reasons the LXX preferred to render *qdš* as *hágios* rather than as *hierós*.[96] Similarly it changed *hagi-* (*hagízein, hagismós,* etc.) into *hagia-* (*hagiázein, hagiasmós,* etc.) in search of a more appropriate expression of the biblical understanding of holiness.[97] LXX texts originally composed in Hebrew (Sirach, Baruch, 1 Maccabees, Judith) or Aramaic (Tobit) exhibit the same findings with regard to the relationship between *qdš/hágios* as do the canonical writings; hence one can assume the same concurrence and the same meaning of *hágios* in the texts composed in Greek (2 Maccabees, Wisdom of Solomon).

One stylistic peculiarity is worth noting in this regard. 1 Maccabees calls the "sanctuary" *tá hágia* 26 times, *hagíasma* 13 times, and *tó hágion* once, while 2 Maccabees uses neither *hagíasma* nor *tá hágia,* but rather the adj. *hágios* together with a substantive (*tópos* in 1:29; 2:18; 8:17; *hierón* in 5:15; 13:10; 15:17; *neṓs* in 9:16; *oíkos* in 15:32, whereas the Wisdom of Solomon uses *hágios* 13 times, though, as another book composed in Greek, more often *hósios* (16 times); cf. Wis. 10:15, *laós hósios,* instead of the normal LXX rendering *laós hágios,* though 17:2 has *éthnos hágion* like Ex. 19:6; the participants in the exodus are *hósioi* (Wis. 18:1,5,9), though they are also called *hágioi* (18:9), and the believers *hósioi* (4:15; 6:10; 7:27; 10:17).[98]

Kornfeld

V. Qumran. Among the Qumran writings, the Temple Scroll occupies a unique position in that it focuses exclusively on the purity and holiness of the new temple. A ditch or embankment is to surround the sanctuary "which shall divide (*bdl* hiphil) the holy sanctuary *(miqdaš haqqōḏeš)* from the city so that no one can rush into my sanctuary and defile it *(ḥll)*. They shall sanctify (*qdš* piel) my sanctuary and hold it in awe *(yārē')* because I abide among them" (46:9-12). "The city that I will sanctify (*qdš* hiphil), causing my name and my sanctuary to abide in it *(škn),* shall be *qōḏeš* and pure of all impurity" (47:4; cf. l. 11). The sanctuary is not to be defiled by the skins of animals from secular slaughter (47:11-18). Whoever profanes the sanctuary incurs "the iniquity of mortal guilt" (35:7-8). The altar and the temple are to be sanctified and kept "most holy forever and ever" (35:8-9). God sanctifies the temple (29:8) and the city (52:19). The people are to be a holy people for Yahweh (48:7,10). They should sanctify themselves and be holy (51:8,10). Festival days are to be sanctified (27:9; cf. 17:3,10; 27:8).

The remaining Qumran writings emphasize that the community itself is holy. It is *ʿaḏaṯ qōḏeš,* a "holy community" (1QSa 1:12), *ʿaṣaṯ qōḏeš,* a "holy council" (1QS 2:25;

96. See J. Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (Oxford, 1961), 282-87.

97. Festugière, 79-80.

98. Concerning these passages, see O. Procksch, "ἅγιος," *TDNT,* I, 88-97; Cazelles, et al., *DBS,* X, 1434-35.

5:20; 8:21; 1QSa 2:9; 1QH 7:10; CD 20:24; probably also 1QM 3:4; cf. 1QH 4:25, *ᵃṣaṯ qᵉḏôšîm*), or *yaḥaḏ qōḏeš*, "holy fellowship" (1QS 9:2). Its members are "men of holiness" (1QS 5:13; 8:17,23; 9:8), "men of perfect holiness" (1QS 8:20; CD 20:2,5,7). Entry into the community is described thus: "They shall be set apart (*bdl* niphal) as holy *(qōḏeš)*" (1QS 8:11). The community is a "house of holiness" *(bêṯ qōḏeš)* and an assembly of supreme holiness *(sôḏ qōḏeš qoḏāšîm)* for Aaron" (8:5-6). The "men of the community shall set apart a house of holiness for Aaron in order that it may be united to the most holy things" (9:6). Contextually one sees that the community itself replaces the temple as the locus of atonement (cf. 5:6). Moreover, the holiness of the community also obligates it ethically, bestowing upon holiness itself a pronounced ethical component reflected in references to the "fruit of holiness on my tongue," i.e., truthful words (10:22), the "way of holiness," or correct behavior (6:20), and the holy commandments (CD 5:11; 20:30). God's holy design is his divine plan (1QS 11:19; 1QM 13:2).

Warriors in the eschatological war are also holy. Their camp is the camp of the holy ones (1QM 3:5). God demonstrates his power through the holy ones among his people (6:6), and those who die in battle are holy (9:8). The text also emphasizes, however, that holy angels fight alongside these warriors; "holy angels shall be with their hosts" (1QM 7:6), "the angelic host are among our numbered men" (1QM 12:7-8; cf. also 1:16; 10:10-11; 12:4; 1QS 11:7-8; 1QSa 2:8-9). This context also includes the nearly 200 occurrences in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice.[99] One also encounters traditional biblical expressions such as "God's holy spirit" (1QS 9:3; 1QH 7:7-8; 9:32; 12:12; CD 7:4). It is especially noteworthy that the prophets are the "anointed ones of his holy spirit" (CD 2:12; cf. 6:1, "his holy anointed ones"). God's holy dwelling is in heaven (*zᵉḇûl*, 1QS 10:3; 1QM 12:1; 1QH 3:34; *mā'ôn*, 1QM 12:2; 1QSb 4:25).[100]

Ringgren

99. See C. Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice. HSS* 27 (1985), 443-47.

100. Concerning "holiness in Qumran," cf. D. Barthélemy, "La sainteté selon la Communauté de Qumran et selon l'Évangile," in J. van der Ploeg, et al., eds., *La Secte de Qumrân et les origines du Christianisme. Recherches bibliques* IV (1959) 203-16; F. Nötscher, "Heiligkeit in den Qumranschriften," *RevQ* 2 (1960) 163-81, 315-44; H. W. Kuhn, *Enderwartung und Heil: Untersuchungen zu den Gemeindeliedern von Qumran. SUNT* 4 (1966).

קָהָל *qāhāl;* קהל *qhl;* קְהִלָּה *qᵉhillâ;* קֹהֶלֶת *qōheleṯ*

Contents: I. Etymology. II. Distribution: 1. Synonyms; 2. Akk. *puḫru;* 3. Ugar. *pḫr;* 4. Phoen. *mpḫrt.* III. OT: 1. Occurrences; 2. Syntax. IV. 1. Basic Technical Meaning; 2. The Religious-Cultic Assembly in Dtn/Dtr Texts; 3. *qāhāl* and *'ēḏâ* in P; 4. Prophets; 5. Chronicler's History; 6. Psalms; 7. Wisdom. V. Qumran. VI. Rabbinic Writings. VII. LXX.

---

qāhāl. G. W. Ahlström, *Who Were the Israelites?* (Winona Lake, Ind., 1986); G. W. Anderson, "Israel: Amphictyony: 'am; ḳāhāl; 'eḏāh," *Translating and Understanding the OT. FS H. G. May* (Nashville, 1970), 135-51; P. Azzi, "La notion d''Assemblée' dans l'AT," *Melta Recherches Orientales* 1 (Kaslik-Journieh, Lebanon, 1965) 5-23; O. Bächli, "Zur Aufnahme von Fremden in die israelitische Kultgemeinde," *Wort — Gebot — Glaube. FS W. Eichrodt. ATANT* 59 (1970), 21-26; K. Berger, "Volksversammlung und Gemeinde Gottes: Zu den Anfängen der christlichen Verwendung von 'ekklesia,'" *ZTK* 73 (1976) 167-207; O. Bulka, "Il popolo di Dio come assemblea cultica alla luce del libro dell'Esodo" (Pars diss., Fac. S. Theol. apud Pont. Univ. S. Thomae de Urbe, Rome, 1974); J. Y. Campbell, "The Origin and Meaning of the Christian Use of the Word ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑ," *JTS* 49 (1948) 130-42; H. Cazelles, "Qehal YHWH," *DBS,* IX, 601-2; W. J. Dumbrell, "The Meaning and the Use of Ekklesia in the NT with Special Reference to Its OT Background" (diss., London, 1956); H.-J. Fabry, "Studien zur Ekklesiologie des AT und der Qumrangemeinde" (diss. Habil., Bonn, 1979), esp. 200-212; Z. W. Falk, "Those Excluded from the Congregation," *BethM* 20 (1974/75) 342-51, 438; A. K. Fenz, "Volk Gottes im AT," *BiLi* 38 (1964/65) 163-70; H. W. Hertzberg, *Werdende Kirche im AT. Theologische Existenz heute* 20 (1950); F.-L. Hossfeld, "Volk Gottes als 'Versammlung,'" in J. Schreiner, ed., *Unterwegs zur Kirche: Alttestamentliche Konzeptionen. QD* 110 (1987), 123-42; A. Hurvitz, "Linguistic Observations on the Biblical Usage of the Priestly Term *'ēḏâ,*" *Tarbiz* 40 (1971) 261-67 (Heb.); idem, *A Linguistic Study of the Relationship Between the Priestly Source and the Book of Ezekiel: A New Approach to an Old Problem. CahRB* 20 (1982); U. Kellermann, "Erwägungen zum deuteronomischen Gemeindegesetz Dt 23,2-9," *BN* 2 (1977) 33-47; H. Klein, "Die Aufnahme Fremder in die Gemeinde des Alten und des Neuen Bundes," *Theologische Beiträge* 12 (1981) 21-34; R. Köbert, "*qhl* (pal.-aram.) — λαός — ἐκκλησία," *Bibl* 46 (1965) 464; E. Koffmahn, "Die Selbstbezeichnungen der Gemeinde von Qumran auf dem Hintergrunde des ATs" (diss., Vienna, 1959); J. D. W. Kritzinger, *Qᵉhal Jahwe: Wat dit is en wie daaraan mag behoort* (Kampen, 1957); J. Maier, "Zum Gottesvolk- und Gemeinschaftsbegriff in den Schriften vom Toten Meer" (diss., Vienna, 1958); J. Milgrom, "Priestly Terminology and the Political and Social Structure of Pre-Monarchic Israel," *JQR* 69 (1978/79) 65-81; H.-P. Müller, "קָהָל *qāhāl* assembly," *TLOT,* III, 1118-26; C. Ramirez, "El vocabulario técnico de Qumran," *Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Cientificas "La Idea de Dios en la Biblia"* (Madrid, 1971), 325-443; L. Rost, *Die Vorstufen von Kirche und Synagoge im AT. BWANT* 76 (1938); W. Schrage, "'Ekklesia' und 'Synagoge': Zum Ursprung des urchristlichen Kirchenbegriffs," *ZTK* 60 (1963) 178-202; J. Schreiner, "Volk Gottes als Gemeinde des Herrn in deuteronomischer Theologie," *Segen für die Völker: Gesammelte Schriften zur Entstehung und Theologie des ATs* (Würzburg, 1987), 244-62; P. Seidensticker, "Die Gemeinschaftsform der religiösen Gruppen des Spätjudentums und der Urkirche," *SBFLA* 9 (1959) 94-108; F.-J. Stendebach, "Versammlung — Gemeinde — Volk Gottes: Alttestamentliche Vorstufen von Kirche?" *Jud* 40 (1984) 211-24; H. W. Wolff, "Volksgemeinde und Glaubensgemeinde im Alten Bund," *EvT* 9 (1949/50) 65-82; W. P. Wood, "The Congregation of Yahweh: A Study of the Theology and Purpose of the Priestly Document" (diss., Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, 1974).

I. Etymology. The Heb. primary noun *qāhāl* was adopted by later languages, including Jewish Aramaic, Christian Palestinian Aramaic, and Syriac, but is not found in earlier languages. The subsequent history of the word (Jewish Aram. *qᵉhālā'*, "congregation, community"; Christian Palestinian Aram. "assembly, people"; Syr. *qahlā'*, "crowd") suggests the original basic meaning "assembly, assembled group of people." This meaning corresponds to OSA *qhl/qhlt,* which can refer both to the "assembly" of the council and to the "congregation" or "community" of a god.[1]

Two basic hypotheses have been put forward regarding the etymology. First, some scholars derive *qāhāl* from **qal,* "calling," a verb with medial *w,* though such a verb *qwl* is nowhere attested.[2] Another derivation from a rare Assyrian root *ku'ulu,* "assemble," is problematical because although this root has in the meantime been frequently attested, its meaning in such witnesses is "hold (fast)."[3] Neither, in reverse fashion, can *qôl* derive from *qāhāl.*[4] No corresponding, semantically similar noun has been attested, nor can the verb *qāhal* be a primary verb.[5] Second, other scholars suggest that *qāhāl* is a primary noun that cannot be explained on the basis of evidence from other languages and is to be distinguished etymologically from → קוֹל *qôl.*

The basic meaning also explains the semantic nuances exhibited by the verb and other substantive forms. Only the rare fem. participial construction *qōheleṯ* requires additional comment because of the numerous interpretations put forward. The form clearly represents a feminine qal participle even though the qal is not otherwise attested and the feminine form is associated with masculine predicates. Moreover, *qōheleṯ* as a personal name is used with the article at least in Eccl. 12:8 and 7:27 (cj.) and is thus understood there as an appellative. This form has been perceived as so unusual that some scholars try to interpret it as a translation error from Aramaic.[6] A certain consensus is inclined to understand *qōheleṯ* as an office designation meaning approximately "leader of the assembly, speaker in the assembly,"[7] and to view the peculiar form itself as a characteristic of late language.[8] Another unpersuasive suggestion is that of R. Pautrel, who understands *qōheleṯ* as a collective designation (corresponding to *yōšeḇeṯ*) in the sense of "personified public opinion."[9] One is better advised to follow the LXX *ekklēsiástēs,* "member of the *ekklēsía,*" in understanding this form as a teacher in the

---

1. See ContiRossini, 230; Müller, 1118-19.
2. Advocates include H. Bauer, "Die hebräischen Eigennamen als sprachliche Erkenntnisquelle," *ZAW* 48 (1930) 75; Wolff, 70; cautiously also H. C. M. Vogt, *Studie zur nachexilischen Gemeinde in Esra-Nehemia* (Werl, 1966), 91 n. 153.
3. *GesB,* 705; *AHw,* II, 502-3.
4. See W. F. Albright, "The High Place in Ancient Palestine," *Volume du Congrès, Strasbourg 1956. SVT* 4 (1957), 256.
5. Müller, 1119.
6. Most recently E. Ullendorff, "Meaning of *qhlt,*" *VT* 12 (1962) 215, who suggests the Aramaic determinate state was mistaken for a Heb. fem. ending.
7. O. Eissfeldt, *The OT: An Intro.* (Eng. trans. 1965), 492.
8. C. F. Whitley, *Koheleth, His Language and Thought. BZAW* 148 (1979), 4-5.
9. R. Pautrel, *L'Ecclésiaste* (Paris, ³1958), 9-10.

assembly of the people[10] or in the cultic congregation, though *qāhāl* is quite uncertain in these two meanings during this late period, nor does anything in the book itself suggest such an association.[11] These reservations have raised anew the question concerning *qhl* in *qōhelet*. N. Lohfink adduces Eccl. 12:9 in interpreting *qāhāl* as a "philosophical circle," an appellative that the unnamed *ḥākām* then appropriated.[12] D. Michel follows Whitley in interpreting *qhl* legally (cf. Syr. *qhl*, "to consider") as a "skeptic," a suggestion that would be more attractive if it could be demonstrated without reference to Syriac.

II. Distribution.

1. *Synonyms.* Since Rost and especially as regards the ecclesiological semantic component, scholars invariably adduce → עדה *'ēdâ* and → עם *'am* as synonyms of *qāhāl*. Because these references are generally made in studies of the OT precursors of the early church, however, and have thus proven inadequate for assessing *qāhāl* in its OT context, other concepts have increasingly drawn attention as well, especially from the literature of early Judaism, including → סוד *sôḏ*, → עצה *'ēṣâ*, → מרזח *marzēaḥ*, and → יחד *yaḥaḏ*. Other terms deserving attention include *ḥᵃḇûrâ* and Aram. *kᵉništā'*.[13]

2. *Akk. puḫru.* The most appropriate equivalent to *qāhāl* among ancient languages is Sem. *pḫr*. The Akk. vb. *paḫāru* means "assemble," in the D stem "gather, collect." The noun *puḫru* (which was adopted into Aramaic) means "assembly, council (of gods and people)," and ultimately "totality (of living beings or things)."[14] The Sumerian worldview already thought the earthly form of society corresponded precisely to the world of the gods; accordingly, the king's council corresponded to an "assembly of divine beings" (Sum. *ûkkin;* Akk. *puḫur ilani*[15]). People were less inclined to view the heavenly forms as a reflection of earthly circumstances even if they had originated thus; rather, they served as a legitimation for earthly forms of society up to the early forms of democracy, the authorized "people's assembly,"[16] which even during the period of the ascendant monarchy with its inclination to concentrate power still continued to meet for adjudication (cf. the Hittite *pankuš*).[17]

---

10. P. Joüon, "Sur le nom de Qoheleth," *Bibl* 2 (1921) 53-54.

11. See D. Michel, *Qohelet. EdF* 258 (Darmstadt, 1988), 4-8.

12. N. Lohfink, *Kohelet. NEB* (1980), 12.

13. → חבר *ḥāḇar (chābhar)*, IV, 193-97.

14. *AHw*, II, 810-11, 876-77.

15. Cf. W. Röllig, *RLA*, III, 498-99; J. van Dijk, *RLA*, III, 538-39; G. Evans, "Ancient Mesopotamian Assemblies," *JAOS* 78 (1958) 1-11, 114-15.

16. See A. Malamat, "Kingship and Council in Israel and Sumer: A Parallel," *JNES* 22 (1963) 247-53; esp. T. Jacobsen, "Primitive Democracy in Ancient Mesopotamia," *JNES* 2 (1943) 159-72.

17. A different view is taken by J. A. Soggin, *Das Königtum in Israel. BZAW* 104 (1967), 136-46, who thinks Jacobsen has severely overestimated the democratic character of the *puḫru*.

3. *Ugar. pḥr.* In Ugarit, *pḥr* refers to the "assembly, totality,"[18] either of the clan *(pḥr qbṣ)*[19] of heirs,[20] or especially frequently of the gods,[21] the court of the divine king, El. Even though these witnesses do attest *pḥr* in theological contexts, it is not attested in such contexts in reference to a religiously qualified "community" or "assembly" of people.

4. *Phoen. mpḥrt.* The 10th-century B.C.E. Yehawmilk inscription mentions the *mpḥrt 'l gbl qdšm,* "the assembly of the holy gods of Byblos."[22] The Karatepe inscription (ca. 720 B.C.E.) mentions the *dr bn 'lm,* "circle of the sons of El."[23] Finally the Deir ʿAlla inscription (I 7) mentions a *mw'd* of the *šdy*-gods, probably also an advisory council of the gods.

All these witnesses associate *pḥr* or *mpḥrt* with the notion of a heavenly group with a counterpart in earthly society. In Hebrew the term *qāhāl* similarly occurs only in the combinations *qᵉhal qᵉḏôšîm,* "assembly of holy ones" (Ps. 89:6[Eng. 5]), possibly indicating an identification between the earthly cultic community and the heavenly circle of worshipers, and *qᵉhal rᵉpā'îm,* "assembly of shadows" (Prov. 21:16), an expression recalling Ugaritic mythology and possibly also Akk. *puḫur etemmê,* "assembly of demons."[24]

III. OT.

1. *Occurrences.* According to Even-Shoshan, the root *qhl* occurs 176 times in the OT (Müller: 173 times), with the verb occurring 39 times (19 niphal, 20 hiphil), the noun *qāhāl* 122 times, *qᵉhillâ* twice, *qōheleṯ* 7, **maqhēl* twice, and the place-names *maqhēlôṯ* and *qᵉhēlāṯâ* twice each.

a. Only a few occurrences of *qāhāl* date reliably to the early period. Possibly only Gen. 49:6 and Nu. 22:4 can be ascribed to J, while the other 21 occurrences in the Pentateuch can be ascribed to P^G and P^S. The 11 occurrences in Deuteronomy (6 in Dt. 23) also belong to various strata. Among the 9 occurrences in the Psalms, 26:5 is extremely old, and 89:6(5) is probably at least preexilic. The 3 occurrences in Proverbs date to the earlier (21:16) and later monarchy (26:26) and the postexilic period (5:14). The term occurs 11 times in the Dtr History, 33 times in the Chronicler's History, 10 times in Ezra-Nehemiah. The term *qāhāl* occurs with striking infrequency in the prophetic writings. It does not occur at all among the preexilic prophets Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah, then only 4 times in Jeremiah, albeit exclusively in secondary postinterpretations

---

18. *WUS,* no. 2215; *UT,* no. 2037.

19. See *CML²,* 92.

20. *KTU* 1.14, I, 25.

21. *pḥr 'lm, KTU* 1.47, 29; *pḥr bny 'l, KTU* 1.40, 8, 17, 25, 34; *pḥr m'd, KTU* 1.2, I, 14, 15, 16, 20, 31; *pḥr kkbm, KTU* 1.10, I, 4. For additional references, including *dr 'l, 'dt 'lm, mpḥrt bn 'l,* etc., see W. H. Schmidt, *Königtum Gottes in Ugarit und Israel. BZAW* 80 (²1966), 26ff.; also J. Macdonald, "An Assembly at Ugarit?" *FS C. F. A. Schaeffer. UF* 11 (1979) 515-26.

22. *KAI* 4.4-5.

23. *KAI* 26A.III.19.

24. *AHw,* II, 876.

cal meaning, which is always qualified in the same way as an assembly or gathering either for hostile purposes or to form an army and for war. In Ezk. 23:24; 26:7; 27:27; 38:4; 38:15, this aspect is qualified by a series in which *qāhāl* stands either in the penultimate position and is interchangeable with *'am raḇ* (26:7) or *ḥayil raḇ* (38:15), or in the final position as a summary of horses, chariots, and riders. Jer. 44:15 also exemplifies this use of series. Here *qāhāl* refers to a fortuitous gathering of people qualified more specifically as a gathering of men and women; the term *gāḏôl* underscores the basic technical meaning, and the ptcp. *hā'ōmᵉḏôṯ* the fortuitous character of the assembly.

Ps. 26:5 (preexilic) and Prov. 21:16 exemplify texts preserving the basic technical meaning. Both involve construct expressions in which *qāhāl* specifies a "numerical accumulation" qualified more specifically by the *nomen rectum* (*mᵉrē'îm* in Ps. 26:5; *rᵉpā'îm* in Prov. 21:16). The same dynamic basically applies to all such construct expressions.

Synonyms or antonyms can be used in parallelism or *chiasmus* in the immediate context, while the terms *'am, 'ēḏâ, 'ᵃḏaṯ yiśrā'ēl, bᵉnê yiśrā'ēl,* or *kol-yiśrā'ēl* can be used within the extended context of the verse or pericope or be combined directly with the term *qāhāl* (see above). The expressions *kol-qᵉhal-yiśrā'ēl, haqqāhāl lᵉyiśrā'ēl,* and those with *'am* and *'ēḏâ* do not allow conclusions regarding a specific kind of assembly as an institution or legal entity. Such is not the case, however, regarding expressions such as *qᵉhal yhwh* or *yôm haqqāhāl,* which must, however, be examined from a diachronic perspective.

2. *The Religious-Cultic Assembly in Dtn/Dtr Texts.* Gen. 49:6 and Nu. 22:4 probably represent the earliest (pre-Dtn) witnesses and illustrate the basic technical meaning. The 11 occurrences in the book of Deuteronomy, with the exception of 31:30, clearly use the term in a specific context.

a. The community law in 23:2-9(1-8) uses the expression *qᵉhal yhwh* 6 times in quick succession. Recent scholarship agrees that this pericope developed in stages and disagrees only with regard to its dating (pre- or postexilic), though much suggests that the basic text dates to the preexilic period.[26] Regardless of how one dates the various parts of the pericope or understands its overall development, the community law in any case addresses the requirements for entry into the "assembly of Yahweh" *(qᵉhal yhwh).* The regulations themselves belong contextually and thematically to regulations concerning sexual matters, including 22:13–23:15(14).[27] This context includes the cultic-sexual issue of mutilation addressed in v. 2(1) and the interpretation of the bastard in v. 3(2) as the son of a temple prostitute.[28] The specific and irrevocable exclusion of Moab and Ammon from the assembly of Yahweh and their inclusion among those mentioned in vv. 2,3(1,2) might derive from their incestuous origin as described in Gen. 19:30ff. The striking and conscious exception of Edom and Egypt provides con-

26. See Hossfeld, 128-29.

27. See G. Braulik, "Die Abfolge der Gesetze in Deuteronomium 12–26 und der Dekalog," in N. Lohfink, ed., *Das Deuteronomium: Entstehung, Gestalt und Botschaft. BETL* 68 (1985), 260.

28. So Klein, 28.

firmation by way of contrast. To that extent, the law's attempt to keep the assembly of Yahweh cultically and sexually pure certainly accords with the typical preexilic Israelite inclination to be rather sensitive in sexual matters and to reject the (Canaanite) sacralization of the sexual (cf. in this regard the formulaic expression "commit an abomination in Israel"[29]). As with many ancient ritual regulations, later authors had difficulty understanding them and thus provided additional historical arguments supporting the prohibitions in Dt. 23:5ab,6(4ab,5). Such actions, however, are more difficult to explain when the basic text dates to the more recent postexilic period. The echo of the community law in Lam. 1:10 and especially in Neh. 13:1-3 and Ezr. 9:10-12 suggests that the law originated contemporaneous with Ezra and Nehemiah. Even if Mic. 2:5 is disqualified as a preexilic witness to the expression *qᵉhal yhwh,*[30] the basic text of Dt. 23:2-9(1-8) and its echo in Lam. 1:10 do show that the notion of a *qᵉhal yhwh* was associated with cultic connotations during the preexilic period and influenced the later Dtn redactors. In connection with the community law, the expression *qᵉhal yhwh* became a technical term for a religious and cultic assembly that excluded men with genital defects or of the wrong lineage (cf. Dt. 23:2-4[1-3]; cf. in this regard the discussion in Rost).

b. The effects of this theological technical term can also be seen in a late Dtr stratum that at the same time introduces significant new accentuation. The redactor is extremely concerned with articulating the religious-cultic consequences of the Horeb event as consequences applicable to Yahweh's covenant community.

Dt. 5:22 uses *qāhāl* to refer to the assembly of Israelites who receive the Decalog and through it become the people of Yahweh. The occurrences in 9:10; 10:4; 18:16, passages belonging to the same redactional stratum, show that the Dtr redactor is using the term to encompass more than merely the group actually assembled at Horeb. The expression *yôm haqqāhāl* is used there to articulate what happened at Horeb and to provide theological content for the term *qāhāl,* which now refers to the community that permanently possesses the law or Decalog in the ark.[31]

The occurrences of the verb in the hiphil in Dt. 4:10 and 31:12 belong to the same redactional stratum and focus on the assembling of the people at Horeb (4:10) and the subsequent assemblies (31:12) in the land for the Festival of Booths in the seventh year.

In the books extending from Joshua through 1 Kings, and with the exception of Jgs. 20:2; 21:5,8; 1 S. 17:47; 1 K. 8:65 (the term does not occur at all in 2 Kings), the term *qāhāl* is used in the expression *kol-qᵉhal-yiśrā'ēl* and in every instance (Josh. 8:35; 1 K. 8:14[bis],22,55 etc.) in a cultic context. The equivalent context and expressions suggest the influence of the theological use of *qāhāl* in Deuteronomy. Both Josh. 8 (construction of the altar and proclamation of the law on Mt. Ebal) and 1 K. 8 (transfer of the ark) involve a currently unfolding event such that alongside the basic meaning "gathering of people" for such an event there is also emphasis on the notion of a fixed

29. See M. Rose, *Der Ausschliesslichkeitsanspruch Jahwes. BWANT* 106 (1975), 34-35.
30. So H. W. Wolff, *Micah* (Eng. trans. 1990), 70, 80.
31. Hossfeld, 131.

or enduring institution in the sense of the Dtr understanding. In Josh. 8:35 this specific assembly includes those mentioned in v. 33: "all Israel, alien as well as citizen, with their elders and officers and their judges . . . the Levitical priests who carried the ark of the covenant of Yahweh," as well as the women and children added in v. 35 itself. Contextually (cf. 8:1ff.) the assembly in 1 K. 8:14 includes only men, "the elders of Israel and all the heads of the tribes, the leaders of the ancestral houses of the Israelites" (v. 1), "all the men of Israel" (v. 2). 1 K. 8:65 adds to the quantitative aspect the cultic connotation described above. By contrast, 12:3 uses the expression *kol-qᵉhal-yiśrā'ēl* again, though probably in connection with a political assembly rather than in a cultic context.

Jgs. 20:2; 21:5,8; 1 S. 17:47 use *qāhāl* in the basic technical sense but with a completely different connotation in reference to a crowd of people assembled for war, with Jgs. 21:5,8 additionally associated with the war of Yahweh.

3. *qāhāl and 'ēḏâ in P.* Except for occurrences in Deuteronomy, Gen. 49:6, and Nu. 22:4, the remaining 21 Pentateuch occurrences can be ascribed to P. Within P itself, use of the term *qāhāl* shifts slightly between the basic Priestly writing (P^G) and the secondary Priestly addenda (P^S).

a. P^G uses *qāhāl* in its basic meaning. The 3 occurrences in Genesis (28:3; 35:11; 48:4) refer to the quantitative amalgamation of peoples with whom Jacob is blessed. This blessing derives from Gen. 17:5, where Abraham becomes the ancestor of a large number of peoples (because of the etymology of the name Abraham, the word *hāmôn* replaces *qāhāl*).

The occurrences in Exodus (Ex. 12:6; 16:3) as well as the P^G occurrences in Nu. 14:5; (19:20); 20:4,6,10; (22:4) are either qualified by a specific expression emphasizing *qāhāl* as a technical entity or refer to the terms *'am, 'ēḏâ, 'ᵃḏaṯ yiśrā'ēl,* or *bᵉnê yiśrā'ēl* in emphasizing that these groups assembled for various, specific reasons. P^G understands *'ēḏâ* as a qualitative term describing the particular character of the assembly of the children of Israel, while *qāhāl* maintains its basic technical meaning as a gathering focused on a currently unfolding occasion. The expression in Ex. 12:6 clearly refers to the assembly of the *'ēḏâ* for the current Passover. In Nu. 14:5 the *'ēḏâ* assembles because of an unfolding mutiny. In the story of the waters of Meribah (Nu. 20:1-12*), P^G varies the synonymity between *'ēḏâ* and *bᵉnê-yiśrā'ēl* in v. 1 by using apposition instead of the more customary construct expression. The new notion of the "whole congregation" now alternates within the story with the technical term *qāhāl* (*'ēḏâ* in vv. 2,8a; *qāhāl* in vv. 6,10). This alternation with *'ēḏâ* suggests that the fixed group of persons called *'ēḏâ* is now coming together for a specific, currently unfolding occasion and that this current action of "assembling" is called *qāhāl.* The term *qāhāl* is associated syntactically in v. 10 with *hammōrîm,* additionally underscoring the character of the *qāhāl* as a gathering to address a specific, topical issue. The expression *bᵉnê-yiśrā'ēl* recurs at the end of v. 12 corresponding to the beginning and is then joined by the concrete term *qāhāl.* Even though the words are used synonymously in the context of the pericope, they are not equivalents. P^G accentuates in *qāhāl* the basic meaning and thus the quantitative aspect, whereas *'ēḏâ* is a qualitatively determined term.

cultic assembly on the occasion of David's succession. Here too the basic theological qualification exhibits more subtle nuances as well. In v. 1 the term refers to an assembly for the purpose of establishing donations for the temple construction. In vv. 10 and 20 the same assembly comes together cultically to rejoice in thanksgiving for the donations. It is difficult to determine precisely who the actual members of the assembly were, however, though v. 6 mentions the leaders of ancestral houses, the leaders of the tribes, the commanders of the thousands and of the hundreds, and the officers over the king's work, and v. 9 *hā'ām*. 1 Ch. 28:8 theologically qualifies the commission to build the temple, and here *qāhāl* is itself theologically qualified in the Dtn/Dtr sense; Israel as the *qāhāl yhwh* is admonished to obey the law.

By contrast, the remaining occurrences in 1 Ch. 13:2,4 again exemplify how the transparency of the basic meaning allows for extended semantic connotations. V. 1 mentions the leadership of Israel (the commanders of the thousands and of the hundreds, all leaders), from which *lᵉkol-qᵉhal yiśrā'ēl* is delimited in an antonymic sense. David asks this assembly to agree to the results of his meetings with the leaders to transfer of the ark. V. 4 then underscores the delimitation of this assembly over against the circle of leaders by the parallel use of *kol-haqqāhāl* and *kol-hā'ām*. Here *qāhāl* refers to an assembly of the people legally empowered in religious and political matters meeting to address a specific issue.

The term occurs 5 times each in Ezra and Nehemiah, 4 of which are in Ezr. 10. Even though these occurrences are contextually related and qualified, they nonetheless exhibit the two tendencies already observed in the Chronicler's History. Ezr. 10:1 refers to a gathering of people without any particular motivation; *qāhāl* stands here first in a series identifying the people more specifically (men, women, and children of Israel). V. 8 qualifies the term differently with the expression *qᵉhal-haggôlâ*, which in contrast to v. 1 also accentuates the theological character of the true congregation. V. 12 picks up syntactically on *kol-'anšê-yᵉhûḏâ-ûḇinyāmin* and *kol-hā'ām* from v. 9. In the context this assembly is gathering together to discuss the dissolution of mixed marriages. V. 14 differentiates between *kol-haqqāhāl* on the one hand and representation by the officials on the other. Ezr. 2:64 uses the term in its basic technical meaning in summary reference to a numerical entity, in this instance the detailed list of those returning from exile (similarly also Neh. 7:66). Gunneweg notes that the Chronicler interprets this document in his sense as a registry of the true congregation of the new salvific age and ascribes central theological significance to it,[34] a situation also influencing the use of *qāhāl* in this context.

Neh. 5:13 parallels *qāhāl* with *'am* and is qualified more precisely by 5:1 (men of the simple people and their wives). The motive is again a developing issue, namely, the settlement of an argument. In 8:2 *qāhāl* refers back to *hā'ām* in v. 1; the motive here is instruction in the law (adoption of a Dtr tradition). Neh. 8:17 involves the celebration of the Festival of Booths, suggesting that in this case the reference is to a cultic assembly. The text also mentions *haššāḇîm min-haššᵉḇê*, "all those who had returned from

---

34. Ibid., 65.

the captivity." This specification combines Dtr theology with the agenda of the Chronicler's theology (Gunneweg).

Neh. 13:1 is a citation from Dt. 23:4-6(3-5), albeit with significant alteration. The Chronicler replaces *qᵉhal yhwh,* the technical term from Deuteronomy, with *qᵉhal hā'ᵉlōhîm (biqᵉhal hā'ᵉlōhîm).*

The semantic spectrum of *qāhāl* in the Chronicler's History thus extends from the cultic assembly at historical turning points to the assembly focused on political issues and with a varying membership.

6. *Psalms.* Eight of the nine occurrences of *qāhāl* in the Psalms refer to the worship assembly (the exception is 26:5). Unlike the narrative texts discussed above, the psalms do not qualify the term with a specific occasion or a specific group of people, though the motive prompting the assembly is invariably to praise Yahweh or to proclaim his word.

In 22:26(25); 35:18; 40:10-11(9-10), the adj. *raḇ* emphasizes the quantitative aspect inhering in the basic meaning. In 89:6(5); 107:32; 149:1, an additional substantive qualifies this assembly that comes together to praise Yahweh. Ps. 89:6(5) uses *biqᵉhal qᵉḏōšîm,* while 149:1 uses *biqᵉhal ḥᵃsîḏîm* as substantival adjectives to qualify the abstract group of people behind *qāhāl* as "holy" and "faithful"; 107:32 uses *biqᵉhal-'ām* to qualify the group quantitatively. Ps. 26:5 (probably preexilic) uses a construct expression with *qāhāl* as the *nomen regens* indicating a "crowd of people" and thus functioning as a technical term. Ps. 22:23(22); 35:18; and 107:32 are chiastically structured, with 22:23(22) juxtaposing *qāhāl* and *lᵉ'eḥāy,* 35:18 *bᵉqāhāl rāḇ* and *bᵉ'am 'āṣûm,* and 107:32 *biqᵉhal-'ām* and *ûḇᵉmôšaḇ zᵉqēnîm.*

This conscious juxtaposition of *qāhāl* as the worship assembly, on the one hand, and the other designations for gatherings in daily life, on the other, emphasizes the significance of praise of Yahweh for both the cultic and the common spheres. Ps. 22:26(25) and 89:6(5) are parallel in structure. In 22:26(25) *qāhāl* parallels "those who fear him"; 89:6(5) juxtaposes the "heavens" above with the "assembly of the holy ones" below. Ps. 26:5 (preexilic) uses the basic meaning of *qāhāl,* while more recent occurrences understand it as a technical term for the worship assembly.

7. *Wisdom.* The use of *qāhāl* in wisdom texts confirms the multifaceted meanings of the term already discussed. The preexilic admonition in Prov. 26:26 tells how the wicked will be exposed in the public assembly, using *qāhāl* in its basic meaning with no additional specification. Prov. 21:16 similarly draws from the ancient Near Eastern understanding of the netherworld in calling that realm the *qᵉhal rᵉpā'îm.* By contrast, Prov. 5:14 distinguishes between political *(qāhāl)* and cultic *('ēḏâ)* features of assembly, thereby restricting the public forum designated by *qāhāl* to the community assembly. Job 30:28, like Prov. 5:14, similarly emphasizes the political aspect since here the *qāhāl* is summoned for adjudication.

The Hebrew text of Sirach makes frequent use of *qāhāl* and is inclined to use the term to denote a political assembly. Sir. 7:7; 15:5; 23:24; 33:18; 46:7 all clearly refer to the secular, judicial assembly. By contrast, 50:13,20 refer to a cultic context. Sirach ul-

timately approaches the notion of the Greek polis; the *'am (dēmos)* assembles in the *qāhāl (ekklēsía).* The significance of rhetoric (15:5) suggests that votes were cast in this assembly. One important task of this assembly alongside its judicial function and worship is the praise of wisdom (31:11; 44:15).

Hossfeld — Kindl

V. Qumran. The root *qhl* occurs ca. 50 times in the Qumran writings, 20 of which are found in texts from 2Q through 10Q that were unpublished at the time of this writing. The verb occurs in only 5 passages. The term *qhl* occurs 8 times in 11QT, 8 in 1QM, 2 in 4QM^a, 4 in CD, 3 in 1QSa, 2 each in 1QH and 4QpNah, and elsewhere. Strikingly it does not occur at all in 1QS.

In Qumran, too, the term exhibits a broad semantic spectrum. Surprisingly the earliest texts apparently still understood *qāhāl* as a fully valid self-designation for the community itself. A letter from the "teacher of righteousness" to the high priest of Jerusalem (4QMMT)[35] during the period when the community was being established contains among other things an explanation of the teacher's understanding of various factors excluding a person from the "community" *(qāhāl),* apparently a Qumran-Essene interpretation of Dt. 23 (cf. 4QFlor 1:4). It thus seems that the community in Qumran did not reject the term *qāhāl* as a self-reference until a later period.

1QM understands *qāhāl* as the "crowd" or "host" accompanying Gog and Magog (1QM 11:16; cf. Ezk. 38:7), as a host of nations (14:5), and as a crowd of evildoers (15:10). 4QpNah 3:5,7 use *qāhāl* to refer to "those who seek smooth things," probably the Jerusalem orthodoxy. All these passages are clearly intended pejoratively. According to 1QM 4:10, one of the battle standards bore the inscription *q^{e}hal 'ēl,* referring to a specific unit of the eschatological army but not to the entire community and certainly not to eschatological Israel as such.

1QSa understands *qāhāl* more as an ecclesiological term. 1QSa 2:4 clearly alludes to Dt. 23 and at the same time associates *qāhāl* closely with *'ēḏâ.* The *qāhāl* refers to the assembly of the *'ēḏâ.* Similarly it refers to the concrete actualization of the *'ēṣeṯ hayyaḥaḏ* in the broader context of regulations concerning the cultic purity of participants in the assembly *(mw'd = 'ēḏâ;*[36] 2:2-10), which meets as the *'ēṣeṯ hayyaḥaḏ.*[37] Here *qāhāl* and *mô'ēḏ* seem to be identical, though the latter is semantically broader (cf. 2:11,13). In that case *qāhāl* is thus a special cultic form of the *mô'ēḏ.* 1QSa 1:25 then uses *qāhāl* and *'ēṣeṯ hayyaḥaḏ* in exact parallelism. Because both are initiated by a *t^e'ûḏâ,* a "call" or "summons," they represent a specifically summoned assembly of the *yaḥaḏ* rather than an enduring entity. The *qāhāl* can be convened on three occasions: for adjudication, advice, and war. Hence *qāhāl* is not a theologically significant term for the Qumran authors.[38]

---

35. See E. Qimron and J. Strugnell, "An Unpublished Halakhic Letter from Qumran," *Biblical Archaeology Today: Proceedings of the Internationsl Congress on Biblical Archaeology* (Jerusalem, 1985), 400-407.

36. → עדה *'ēḏâ,* X, 480-81.

37. → יחד *yaḥaḏ,* VI, 40-48.

38. See Maier, 16.

rather the existence of several translators, since basically all occurrences in Dtn/Dtr material and in the Chronicler's History are translated as *ekklēsiázein,* and all in Ezekiel and Esther and most in P as *synágein.*

Translations of the noun *qāhāl* confirm these findings. It is rendered 68 times as *ekklēsía,* 36 as *synagōgḗ,* 6 as *óchlos,* once each as *sýstasis, synédrion,* and *plḗthos.* In 4 instances the LXX had a different text for Deuteronomy. It uses *ekklēsía* in all occurrences in Dtn/Dtr material and in the Chronicler's History (exception: Dt. 5:22, *synagōgḗ*) as well as consistently in the Psalms (exception: Ps. 40:11[10]). Likewise, *synagōgḗ* is generally the term used in the Tetrateuch, in Jeremiah, and in Ezekiel (in the last also occasionally *óchlos*).

The frequent hypothetical assertion that *qāhāl* may represent an anticipatory equivalent for NT *ekklēsía,* and *'ēḏâ* an equivalent for the synagogue of late Judaism, needs reexamination.[43] With few exceptions, *'ēḏâ* is indeed generally rendered as *synagōgḗ* (132 times; exceptions: 11 times as *episýstasis,* 4 as *plḗthos,* etc.), but never as *ekklēsía.*

The rendering of *'ēḏâ* as *synagōgḗ,* however, is dominated by the 108 occurrences in the Tetrateuch, where *qāhāl* (see above), too, is rendered as *synagōgḗ.* What one finds is that at least as regards the Torah, the text possessing the highest canonical status during the period when the LXX was composed, the two most significant ecclesiological terms in the OT are basically reserved exclusively for the synagogue. Nor is this finding refuted by the almost exclusive rendering of the occurrences in Deuteronomy as *ekklēsía,* since here the *qāhāl* law, namely, Dt. 23:2,3,4,9(1,2,3,8) (assessment of the synagogue[-community] from a certain perspective) also influenced the rendering of 9:10; 18:16; 31:30.

Hence at least according to the LXX understanding, usage in the Torah does not allow an interpretation of *qāhāl* or *'ēḏâ* as *ekklēsía.* The intertestamental collective classifications of early Judaism are thus more promising for resolving this issue.[44] Some scholars suggest that the NT understanding of *ekklēsía* was influenced by its derivation from Hellenistic Jewish Christianity around Stephen and then appropriated by Paul.[45]

Fabry

---

43. Concerning this discussion, cf. K. L. Schmidt, "ἐκκλησία," *TDNT,* III, 524-32; W. Schrage, "συναγωγή," *TDNT,* VII, 802-5.

44. → יחד *yaḥad,* VI, 40-48; → מרזח *marzēaḥ,* IX, 10-15.

45. Cf. in this regard Schrage and Berger, discussed esp. in J. Roloff, "ἐκκλησία," *EDNT,* I, 411-12; H. Merklein, "Die Ekklesia Gottes: Der Kirchenbegriff bei Paulus und in Jerusalem," *BZ* 23 (1979) 48-70.

קַו qaw; קָוֶה qāweh; תִּקְוָה tiqwâ

Contents: I. Etymology. II. OT: 1. Occurrences; 2. Meaning; 3. Use. III. 1. Qumran; 2. LXX.

I. Etymology. The noun *qaw* derives from the East Semitic linguistic sphere, with occurrences found only in Akkadian,[1] where *qû(m)* I means "hemp" (a plant) or "thread" (spun or woven) and is a loanword from Sumerian. In the West Semitic sphere the word is attested only in Hebrew (OT and Qumran) and Jewish Aramaic.

Derivation of the noun *qaw* from a verb → קוה *qwh* thus seems less plausible even though the form *qāweh* attested as *K* (1 K. 7:23; Jer. 31:39; Zech. 1:16) and the synonym *tiqwâ* I (Josh. 2:18,21) might suggest as much.[2] Although the reverse derivation has also been discussed,[3] a lack of evidence renders these attempts unpersuasive.

II. OT.

1. *Occurrences.* The noun *qaw/qāweh* occurs 12 times in the OT (also as a variant reading in Sir. 44:5) and in the compounds *qaw-qāw* in Isa. 18:2,7 and *qaw-lāqāw* in 28:10,13; the related term *tiqwâ* occurs only in Josh. 2:18,21.

2. *Meaning.* In most of its occurrences *qaw* means "measuring line" in connection with construction, real estate, and artisans.[4] Synonyms include *ḥeḇel,* "rope," *ḥûṭ,* "thread," and *pāṯîl,* "thread, line."

3. *Use.* The only place the noun *qaw* occurs as an object of daily activities is the account of the temple inventory in 1 K. 7:23 par. 2 Ch. 4:2, which says that "a measuring

---

qaw. K. Ahrens, "Der Stamm der schwachen Verben in den semitischen Sprachen," *ZDMG* 64 (1910) 161-94, esp. 187; O. Betz, "Zungenreden und süsser Wein: Zur eschatologischen Exegese von Jes 28 in Qumran and im NT," *Bibel und Qumran. FS H. Bardtke* (Berlin, 1968), 20-36, esp. 20; P. A. H. de Boer, "Étude sur le sens de la racine QWH," *OTS* 10 (1954) 225-46; H. Donner, "Ugaritismen in der Psalmenforschung," *ZAW* 79 (1967) 322-50, esp. 327; G. R. Driver, "Isaiah I–XXXIX: Textual and Linguistic Problems," *JSS* 13 (1968) 36-57, esp. 46; idem, "'Another Little Drink' — Isaiah 28:1-22," *Words and Meanings. FS D. Winton Thomas* (Cambridge, 1968) 47-67, esp. 53-58; W. W. Hallo, "Isaiah 28:9-13 and the Ugaritic Abecedaries," *JBL* 77 (1958) 324-38; J. Marböck, "קו — eine Bezeichnung für das hebräische Metrum?" *VT* 20 (1970) 236-39; A. van Selms, "Isaiah 28,9-13: An Attempt to Give a New Interpretation," *ZAW* 85 (1973) 332-39; M. Weippert, "Zum Text von Ps. 19,5 und Jes 22,5," *ZAW* 73 (1961) 97-99.

1. *AHw,* II, 924-25.
2. See *GesB,* 705-6.
3. Cf. Ahrens, 181; *HAL,* III, 1082a; C. Westermann, "קוה *qwh* pi. to hope," *TLOT,* III, 1126-27.
4. See *AuS,* VII, 63.

line of thirty cubits would encircle it [the molten sea] completely."[5] Comparable passages include Isa. 44:13, which mentions the measuring line of the trade artisan. Job 38:5 derives from wisdom discourse, in which Yahweh asks, "Who stretched the line upon it [the earth]?"

The remaining passages (all of which are in the prophetic writings) use the word metaphorically and largely in oracles of judgment. Yahweh uses a plumb line (*'ᵃnāḵ*, Am. 7:7-9) and a measuring line and plummet *(mišqōleṯ*, 2 K. 21:13; Isa. 28:17; Lam. 2:8) to show how Israel, here portrayed as a building, will be torn down, i.e., destroyed. The oracle to Edom in Isa. 34:11,17 exhibits yet another aspect. Here *qaw* serves to remeasure the land that now has no ruler; its future owners, however, will be the eerie animals of the wilderness rather than human beings. By contrast, words of consolation emerge in the prophetic oracles concerning the new measurements of the city of Jerusalem (Jer. 31:39; Zech. 1:16) or of the country (Ezk. 47:3).

Sir. 44:5 also use *qaw* metaphorically (in a marginal note and in the fragmentary version from Masada) to mean approximately "rule (of poetry), poetic meter," a meaning confirmed by 1QH 1:28,29 (cf. Marböck).

A *crux interpretum* is found in Isa. 18:2,7; 28:10,13; Ps. 19:5(4). In Ps. 19:5(4) *qawwām* allegedly means "their measuring line/measure" (heaven and the celestial bodies impose a standard on the elements and on time).[6] Other interpreters suggest the reference is to an audible phenomenon, a "noise, sound" (LXX *phthóngos;* emendation to *qôlām*[7]), or represents a scribal error from *qārām* after Ugar. *qr,* "call, cry."[8] H.-J. Kraus draws attention to the problematical *qaw qāw* in Isa. 28:10,13.[9]

In Isa. 18, similar to Isa. 20, the prophet warns against putting false trust in the aid of the Egyptians, whom he describes as *gôy qaw-qāw ûmᵉḇûsâ,* "a nation that tramples down with muscle power" (v. 2).[10] Some interpreters understand *qaw-qāw* (according to *GesB, qawqāw*) as a reduplicated and thus semantically intensified form of an Arabic noun or adjective constructed analogous to Akkadian parallels.[11] Others adduce 28:10,13 (see below) and construe the term as an imitation of an incomprehensible foreign language.[12]

The expression *ṣaw lāṣāw ṣaw lāṣāw qaw lāqāw qaw lāqāw zᵉ'ēr šām zᵉ'ēr šām* in Isa. 28:10,13 in the oracle against the priests and prophets of Jerusalem has received extremely varied interpretations. Some scholars suggest that it represents the rendering of Assyrian orders and as such the impending deportation (van Selms), or a mocking comparison of the prophet with a teacher trying to teach pupils the alphabet (here the

---

5. Concerning the dimensions, cf. A. Šanda, *Die Bücher der Könige. EHAT* IX/2 (1911), 179; M. Noth, *Könige (1–16). BK* IX/1 (²1983), 155.

6. See N. H. Ridderbos, *Die Psalmen. BZAW* 117 (1972), 177.

7. Donner, "Ugaritismen," 327.

8. *WUS,* no. 2418; cf. Weippert.

9. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59* (Eng. trans. 1987), 271-72.

10. Trans. after H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27* (Eng. trans. 1997), 206, 208.

11. So Driver, *JSS* 13 (1968) 46.

12. So Donner, "Ugaritismen," 327 n. 31; idem, *Israel unter den Völkern. SVT* 11 (1964), 122.

I. 1. *Etymology.* The etymology of the root *qwh* is not entirely clear. Following the lead of K. Ahrens,[1] some scholars suspect that the verb *qwh* represents a denominative of the primary noun *qaw, qāw* (Akk. *qû*). The noun means "thread, line," a meaning also attested in the OT.[2] The meaning "cord, line" is attested in Josh. 2:18,21 for the noun *tiqwâ,* suggesting that the basic meaning resonates in the noun derived from the verb. Taking the primary noun as the point of departure, the basic meaning of the verb *qwh* would then be "to be taut, tense."[3] This derivation, however, is improbable at least for the Akkadian. By contrast, de Boer understands all forms of the root *qaw/qwh* in a unified fashion as meaning "solidity, coherence."[4] Because the governing concept "solidity, coherence" is "somewhat vague" (Westermann) and abstract, however, it is ill suited to explain the basic etymological meaning. The best alternative is to postulate a double root *qwh.*

In connection with Ps. 52:11(Eng. 9), some scholars adduce Akk. *qabû,* "say," in positing a root *qwh* III, "proclaim."[5] Although the context of this passage supports such an interpretation, the versions do not.

2. *Semitic Parallels.* Verbs related to *qwh* I from the Semitic sphere include Akk. *qu'û(m),* "expect, wait for," Syr. *qawwî,* "remain, expect," and Amhar. *qwäyyä,* "wait."[6] Scholars are unsure whether the verb occurs in Ugaritic. The expression *dtqyn hmlt* is generally translated presuming the root *qwy,* "for whom the crowd waits," or the root *wqy,* "whom you value" or "whom you fear."[7] Other Semitic parallels include Arab. *qawiya,* "be/become strong, energetic, mighty," and Mand. *qwa,* "be/become strong."[8]

3. *qwh II.* The root *qwh* II is attested only in languages influenced by the OT. Middle Hebrew attests the verb *qwh* qal and hiphil, "collect," and the subst. *qiwwûy,* "accumulation"; Jewish Aramaic has the verb *qw'* haphel "assemble." Comparable terms include Syr. *qᵉḇā',* "hold together, unite."[9]

The verb occurs in the niphal in the OT with the meaning "collect, gather together" (Gen. 1:9; Isa. 60:9 [cj.];[10] Jer. 3:17). Derivative nouns include *miqweh,* "collection, accumulation" of water (Gen. 1:10; Ex. 7:19; Lev. 11:36), and *miqwâ,* "reservoir" (Isa. 22:11). The term *māqôm* in Isa. 33:21 is often emended to *miqweh,*[11] whereas *miqwēh/miqwē'* in 1 K. 10:28 and 2 Ch. 1:16 should probably be read "from Coa" or "Quwe."[12]

---

1. K. Ahrens, "Der Stamm der schwachen Verben in den semitischen Sprachen," *ZDMG* 64 (1910), 187.
2. *AHw,* II, 924b; → קו *qaw.*
3. *HAL,* III, 1082a; *TLOT,* III, 1126.
4. De Boer, 241.
5. *TLOT,* III, 1126.
6. *AHw,* II, 931; Leslau, *Contributions,* 46.
7. *KTU* 1.2, I, 18, 34-35; *CML,* 79, 144b; *UT,* no. 1143; *WUS,* no. 874.
8. Kopf, 176; *MdD,* 405b.
9. *LexSyr,* 640; *HAL,* III, 1082b.
10. See II.1 below.
11. Cf., however, O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 13–39. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1974), 339 with n. b.
12. E. Würthwein, *Das erste Buch der Könige 1–16. ATD* XI/1 (1976), 128; *HAL,* II, 626b; III, 1083a.

II. 1. *OT Form and Occurrences.* a. The root *qwh* occurs as a verb in the qal and piel, moreover only as an active participle in the qal (6 times, including twice in Isaiah, 3 in Psalms, 1 in Lamentations). It occurs 41 times in the piel (1 in Genesis, 13 in Isaiah, 4 in Jeremiah, 1 in Hosea, 1 in Micah, 14 in Psalms, 5 in Job, 1 in Proverbs, 1 in Lamentations).

The only textually problematical passage with regard to the verb is Isa. 60:9. The expression *kî lî ʾiyîm yᵉqawwû,* recalling 42:4 and 51:5, makes no sense in the context of 60:9. It is thus generally emended to *kî lî ṣîyîm yiqqāwû,* "for me the ships assemble,"[13] and read as the niphal of *qwh* II. In Ps. 39:8(7) the verb might be read with the LXX as the noun *tiqwâ.* The verb would thus occur a total of 45 or 46 times.

b. Derivatives of *qwh* include the nouns *miqweh* (5 occurrences: 3 in Jeremiah, 1 each in 1 Chronicles and Ezra) and *tiqwâ* (32 occurrences: 2 each in Jeremiah and Ezekiel; 1 each in Hosea, Zechariah, Lamentations, and Ruth; 3 in Psalms; 13 in Job; 8 in Proverbs), albeit excluding the two passages in which *tiqwâ* means "cord, line" (Josh. 2:18,21)[14] but including those in which the LXX presupposes a form of the root *qwh* II.[15]

Some question remains whether the second *tiqwâ* in Job 17:15 ought to be emended to *ṭôḇâ* with LXX.[16] If so, the root *qwh* would occur 82 or 83 times in the MT (2 additional in Sir. 6:19; 11:20).

c. It is noteworthy that the root *qwh* does not occur in the historical traditions or narrative parts of the OT (excepting 1 Ch. 29:15 and Ezr. 10:2; Gen. 49:18 is a marginal gloss inserted into the text later as a confessional note).[17] Although the occurrences seem evenly distributed among the prophets (29 occurrences), Psalms (20), and wisdom (27), this relationship changes dramatically upon closer examination of the prophetic contexts. Most passages in the prophets exhibit a clear affinity for the language of the Psalms (Isa. 8:17; 25:9; 26:8; 33:2; 40:31; 49:23; 59:9,11; 64:2[3]; Jer. 13:16; 14:8,19,22; 17:13; Hos. 12:7[6]). That language has also influenced Gen. 49:18; Prov. 20:22; Lam. 2:16; 3:25,29, prompting Westermann to remark that "prophecy has nothing to do with Israel's hope or hopes. Rather, one may clearly determine that the vocabulary of hope and waiting in the OT is not indigenous to the prophetic proclamation."[18]

Verbs and nouns of the root *qwh* are indigenous to the Psalms and to wisdom. The Psalms and texts influenced by them tend to use the verb (ca. 32 times), while wisdom tends to use the noun *tiqwâ* (20/21 times).

2. *LXX.* Surprisingly the LXX does not usually translate the verb *qwh* as *elpízein* (only in Isa. 25:9; 26:8; perhaps *engízein* Hos. 12:7[6] represents a scribal error[19]), but

---

13. C. Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1969), 354; *HAL,* III, 1083a; cf. *BHS.*
14. See I.1 above.
15. See II.2 below.
16. G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 282; *BHS.*
17. G. von Rad, *Genesis. OTL* (Eng. trans. ²1972), 427.
18. *TLOT,* III, 1132.
19. W. Rudolph, *Hosea. KAT* XIII/1 (1966), 222.

with a form of *ménein (hypoménein* 20 times; *anaménein* and *ménein* 3 times each; *periménein* in Gen. 49:18), thus accentuating the notion of "waiting." It generally uses *elpízein* to render the root *bṭḥ*.[20] Other verbs used for *qwh* include *pepoithénai* (Isa. 8:17; 33:2), *prosdokán* (Lam. 2:16), and *epéchein* (Job 30:26). By contrast, the LXX uses *elpís* 20 times to render *tiqwâ*. It uses *hypomonḗ* 4 times each for *miqweh* and *tiqwâ*, and twice *hypóstasis* for *tiqwâ*.

In Jer. 50:7; Mic. 5:6(7) *(synágein);* and Zech. 9:12 *(synagōgḗ)*, the LXX incorrectly read a form of the root *qwh* II. The same situation seems to apply to Hos. 2:17(15), where it translates *lᵉpeṯaḥ tiqwâ* as *dianoíxai sýnesin autḗs*.[21]

3. *Meaning and Word Field.* a. The root *qwh* is not the only one evoking the notion of hoping and expectation in the OT. Other roots include especially → חכה *ḥāḵâ (chākhāh)* (qal and piel); → יחל *yāḥal* (piel and hiphil); → שׂבר *śāḇar* (piel); and the nouns *tôḥeleṯ* and *śēḇer.* Several of these terms frequently parallel *qwh* or appear in the same context.

The most important of these terms are *yḥl* piel (Job 30:26; Ps. 130:5 [hiphil]; Isa. 51:5; Lam. 3:26 [cj. hiphil]; Mic. 5:6[7]; cf. also Ps. 37:7-9 [cj.]) and *tôḥeleṯ* (Ps. 39:8[7]; Prov. 10:28; 11:7). Isa. 8:17 uses *ḥkh* piel parallel to *qwh* piel. Semantically similar verbs include → בטח *bāṭaḥ (bāṭach)*, "trust" (Ps. 25:2-3; cf. *bṭḥ* — *tiqwâ* in Job 11:18; *tiqwâ* — *mibṭâ* in Ps. 71:5), → דמם *dmm* qal, "be still" (Ps. 37:7-9; cf. *dmm* — *tiqwâ* in Ps. 62:6[5][22]), → נבט *nbṭ* hiphil, "look out" (Job 6:19), which also occur in connection with → חכה *ḥāḵâ (chākhāh)* and → יחל *yāḥal.* Hence it is difficult to distinguish semantically the various verbs for hoping and waiting. As far as the two most frequent verbs are concerned, one can perhaps best follow Westermann's suggestion that *yḥl* "in reference to God retains the entire range of meaning that it has in nontheological usage,"[23] whereas *qwh* is much more influenced by its theological use. Similar to *ḥkh* and *śbr, yḥl* would then emphasize more the aspect of "waiting" and *qwh* more the aspect of "hoping." One consideration, however, is that these verbs and their derivatives appear not only in similar contexts but generally also in late (exilic-postexilic) texts, suggesting that they have lost much of their original semantic content and have become increasingly synonymous such that the use of the one or the other depends more on stylistic than semantic considerations.[24]

b. According to Jenni, another peculiarity attaching to the verbs of hoping and waiting is that they are always focused on a goal expressed in the resultative and thus tend to use the piel (*ḥkh* qal once, piel 13 times; *yḥl* piel 27 times, hiphil 17 times; *śbr* piel 8 times).[25] Accordingly the verb *qwh* is almost always associated with an object. The qal participle is always used in a construct expression or takes a suffix. Finite forms of the

---

20. *TDNT,* II, 521.
21. A different view is taken by Rudolph, *Hosea,* 74.
22. In this regard see H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150* (Eng. trans. 1989), 14-15.
23. *TLOT,* II, 541.
24. → חכה *ḥāḵâ (chākhāh),* IV, 362.
25. → יחל *yāḥal,* VI, 51.

piel generally include either *l*ᵉ (18 times) or *'el* (5 times) before the object, though in 6 instances the object takes no preposition. The verbal suffix is used in 3 instances (Ps. 25:21; Isa. 26:8; Lam. 2:16), and in Ps. 25:5 the suffixed *nota accusativi.* Only in negation is absolute usage reliably attested: "I hope for nothing *('im 'ᵃqawweh),* Sheol is my house" (Job 17:13).[26]

Even if with Kraus one understands "Yahweh" as a vocative in Ps. 130:5 and reads the verb *qwh* piel (bis) as an absolute,[27] the second stich of this verse shows that the hope does indeed have a goal: "I wait *('hôḥāltî)* [NRSV 'hope'] for his word." This goal-oriented character of the verb *qwh* already resonating in the basic etymological meaning "be taut, tense" is additionally underscored by frequent parallels with verbs of desire, including *š'p* qal, "long for" (Job 7:2); *'wh* piel, "desire" (Isa. 26:8-9; cf. also *tiqwâ* par. *ta'ᵃwâ* in Prov. 11:23), or of searching, including *bqš* piel (Ps. 69:7[6]), *drš* qal (Lam. 3:25), *šḥr* piel (Isa. 26:9).

It is doubtful, however, that one can distinguish sufficiently between the qal and piel of *qwh* and say that the qal, in contrast to the piel, denotes merely hope in a general sense without any specific goal (Jenni). The piel, too, frequently directs its hope toward Yahweh in a general sense rather than toward a concrete goal (Ps. 25:21; Isa. 25:9; Jer. 14:22; Hos. 12:7[6]), whereas the qal participle, e.g., can mean "those who hope in Yahweh shall renew their strength" (Isa. 40:31), "they shall inherit the land" (Ps. 37:9; cf. the similar statement after the piel impv. in v. 34) or "shall not be put to shame" (Ps. 25:3; Isa. 49:23; cf. Ps. 69:7[6]). These findings suggest rather that the semantic distinction Jenni invokes for *qwh* is based not on any juxtaposition between the qal and piel, but rather in the basic distinction between the participle as an "ongoing, absolute orientation" and the finite verb as an "ever new positing of hope."[28]

c. The verb *qwh* piel means "wait for" especially when used in a hostile sense. "The wicked wait for me *(qiwwû)* to destroy me" (Ps. 119:95; cf. 56:7[6]; Lam. 2:16). Passages using *qwh* piel metaphorically also exhibit an unequivocal attitude of expectation. The vineyard owner "awaits" the results of his work (Isa. 5:2,4) and laborers their wages (Job 7:2; cf. Sir. 6:19). Even though *qwh* piel could also be translated as "hope" in these passages, the emphasis is probably more on "waiting," since the disposition described is based on activities and experiences on the part of the subject that lead one to expect the subject to be "waiting" or "expecting." The meaning "hope" emerges more strongly only when this disposition become more focused in both a temporal and qualitative fashion on the object from which the subject is expecting everything.

d. The notion of "hope" generally emerges when Yahweh is either directly or indirectly the object of the verb, a situation applying to the majority of passages. In more than half of all occurrences (including the doublings in Ps. 27:14; 40:2[1]; 130:5; Isa. 25:9 MT; altogether 23 times), Yahweh is directly named as the object. He is also named indirectly or by extension in passages speaking of his "name" (*šēm,* Ps.

---

26. A different view is taken by F. Horst, *Hiob 1 (1–19). BK* XVI/1 (⁴1983), 240; cf. also NRSV: "If I look for Sheol as my house."

27. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150,* 464, 467.

28. *HP,* 178.

then death, which puts an end to all hope (Job 7:6; Ezk. 37:11; cf. Job 17:13; 1 Ch. 29:15); accordingly both the noun and the verb largely reflect the expectations and hopes of the individual and are never once related to transcendent or eschatological expectations.

III. 1. *General Use.* The root *qwh* circumscribes human hopes and expectations and as such represents an exclusively anthropological phenomenon applicable to other spheres only metaphorically or figuratively. Hence a division of its use into secular and theological contexts for the sake of analysis is less helpful. Rather one can distinguish those contexts in which this phenomenon comes to expression and which in their own turn articulate and qualify more precisely such human hopes and expectations.

Unequivocally secular contexts are rare.[32] Even passages using *qwh* in an apparently metaphorical fashion generally involve a much broader context.

In the second discourse (Job 6:1–7:21), Job compares his own expectations and attitude with a caravan in the desert that self-deceptively keeps watch for water (6:19-20) and with the laborer who waits for pay (7:2). The first metaphor refers to Job's unfulfilled hope in his friends (6:21), the second to the drudgery of his own life (7:2: "like a slave who longs for the shadow"). Job 14:7-8 contrasts human hope with that of a tree that is cut down, since the latter's roots deep in the ground still give it hope. In none of these passages does *qwh* emerge as a concept derived from the given metaphor; it represents rather a key word accompanying the theme of hope in the overall book of Job.[33] A similar situation applies to Ezk. 19:5, where in a *qînâ* the dashed hopes of a lioness reflect the prospects of the royal house. The Song of the Vineyard (Isa. 5:1-7) also uses *qwh* piel (vv. 2,4,7) to refer to Yahweh's hope in Israel's loyalty rather than to the expectations of an actual vintner.

The Psalms and wisdom are the real locus of reflection on human hopes and expectations. Although references to hope are indeed made in other contexts and quite independent of the fixed terminology discussed above,[34] as regards *qwh* and to a large extent also *ḥkh, yḥl,* and *śbr* we find that human hopes and expectations become the central focus especially where people feel their existence or life is being called into question or where wisdom reflects on the prospects and hopes of human life.

2. *Psalms.*

a. Hoping and Waiting for God. The verb *qwh* focuses on God especially in the language of the Psalms and in texts dependent on that language. Westermann suggests that the verb is ultimately at home in the confession of trust, which is why it occurs so frequently in laments of the individual or in related genres (Ps. 25:2-3; 39:8-9[7-8]; 40:2[1]; 71:5 *[tiqwâ];* 130:5).[35]

---

32. See II.3 above.
33. See III.3 below.
34. Cf. Wolff; Zimmerli; H. D. Preuss, *Jahweglaube und Zukunftserwartung. BWANT* 87 (1968).
35. Westermann, *Forschung am AT,* 237ff.; idem, *TLOT.*

In view of current distress and affliction, petitioners confess that they are leaving everything in Yahweh's hands, expect everything from him, and trust in him alone. In such confessions, *qwh* generally occupies the position otherwise occupied by the verbs *bṭḥ* and *ḥsh* or *yḥl*.[36]

Rather than being specifically articulated, the goal of hope and expectation generally emerges from the lament itself. Confessions of this sort are always accompanied by the hope or wish that Yahweh will himself intervene and alter the situation of the petitioner. "And now, O Lord, what do I wait for? My hope *(tôḥeleṯ)* is in you. Deliver me from all my transgressions" (Ps. 39:8-9[7-8]).

This hopeful and expectant disposition is intensified in other passages as well. "In you I hope all day long" (*kol-hayyôm,* Ps. 25:5; cf. Isa. 26:8; 33:2); "for you, O Lord, are my hope, my trust *(miḇṭāḥ),* O Yahweh, from my youth" (Ps. 71:5; cf. 62:6-7[5-6]).

Petitioners live from the experience and certainty that "those who hope in Yahweh will not be put to shame" (*lō' yēḇōšû,* Ps. 25:2-3; cf. Isa. 49:23; Jer. 17:13). Such passages simultaneously presuppose an intact relationship with God in which alone such hope is legitimate (cf. also Ezr. 10:2).[37] This situation also explains why *qwh* often appears in passages whose background likely includes a salvific oracle or priestly assurance (Ps. 27:14; 37:34). This form emerges most clearly in Hos. 12:7(6): "But as for you, return to your God, hold fast to love and justice, and hope continually in your God *(weqawwēh 'el-'elōheyḵā tāmîḏ).*"

The admonition to hope in Yahweh can be accompanied by ethical demands as well (Ps. 37:9,34; cf. Prov. 20:22), corresponding elsewhere to the petition for help in attaining correct behavior (Ps. 25:5,21) or to the statement: "Do not let those who hope in you be put to shame because of me" (69:7[6]).

b. Outside the Psalms, *qwh* is used in the sense of waiting and hoping in Yahweh in similar confessions of trust (Isa. 33:2; Jer. 14:22; cf. Isa. 25:9; 26:8) or in assurances in oracles of salvation (Isa. 40:31; 49:23; 51:5; Jer. 14:8; 17:13) or in admonitions (Lam. 3:25).

Excepting perhaps Isa. 51:5, all these passages reflect the language of the Psalms. As Westermann makes clear,[38] such also applies to Isa. 8:17, where the prophet seals his message after its rejection and confesses in the language of the Psalms, "I will wait *(ḥkh)* on Yahweh, who hides his countenance from the house of Jacob, and I will hope *(qwh)* in him."

In contrast to the Psalms, which generally reflect the hopes of the individual, in many (primarily exilic) passages it is the people who direct their hope toward Yahweh and to whom new hope is given, effectively expanding the experiential background of the phenomenon of hope. Here the nouns also occur more frequently. Yahweh is called the "hope of Israel" (*miqwēh yiśrā'ēl,* Jer. 14:8; 17:13; cf. also *miqwēh 'aḇôṯêhem,* 50:7[39]) and as the God of Israel is petitioned to engage his power as the creator God

36. → יחל *yāḥal,* VI, 55.
37. → בושׁ *bôš (bôsh),* II, 58-59.
38. *TLOT,* III, 1131.
39. In this regard see W. Rudolph, *Jeremia. HAT* I/12 (³1968), 298.

3. *qûṣ*. In the qal, *qûṣ* can be construed with *bᵉ* and *mippᵉnê*. In the first instance, the use of *qûṣ* corresponds to that of *qûṭ*.[11] Because of Esau's Hittite wives, Rebekah loathes her life (Gen. 27:46), i.e., she is weary of her life. In the wilderness the Israelites detest the miserable food (Nu. 21:5); it wearies or even disgusts them. Yahweh admonishes the Israelites to "keep all my statutes and all my ordinances," and not to follow the practices "of a nation that I am driving out before you; because they did all these things [previously mentioned abominations], I abhorred them *(wā'āquṣ bām)*" (Lev. 20:23). That is, he was disgusted with them. The admonition, "My child, do not despise *('al tim'ās)* Yahweh's discipline, or be weary *(wᵉ'al-tāqōṣ)* of his reproof," means "do not avoid it, reject it, be impatient bearing it" (Prov. 3:11). 1 K. 11:25 says that Rezon "was an adversary of Israel all the days of Solomon . . . he despised *(wayyāqoṣ)* Israel." The expression *wayyāqoṣ* need not be emended to *wayyāṣoq* or *wayyāṣeq*,[12] "and he oppressed them"; it expresses rather Rezon's hostile rejection of Israel.[13]

In the qal, *qûṣ* with *mippᵉnê* means "be afraid." Because the Israelites multiplied despite the oppression, the Egyptians came to fear them (Ex. 1:12). When the Israelites entered Moab, Moab feared them (Nu. 22:3). Isaiah tells Ahaz: "For before the child knows how to refuse the evil and choose the good, the land before whose two kings you are in dread will be deserted" (Isa. 7:16).

The hiphil resembles *qûṣ* in the qal with *mippᵉnê*. Isa. 7:6 cites the king of Aram: "Let us go up against Judah and give it a fright *(ûnᵉqîṣennâ)*"; the assumption of a root *qûṣ* II, "tear apart," is unnecessary.[14]

III. LXX. The LXX renders *qûṭ* and *qûṣ* inconsistently, though most frequently with *prosochthízein* (*qûṭ*, Ps. 95:10; Ezk. 36:31; *qûṣ*, Gen. 27:46; Nu. 21:5; 22:3).

Schmoldt

---

11. See 1 above regarding Gen. 27:46; Nu. 21:5.
12. See J. R. Bartlett, "Adversary against Solomon, Hadad the Edomite (1 Kings 11:14-22," *ZAW* 88 (1976) 214-15; *BHS*.
13. M. Noth, *Könige. BK* IX/1 (²1968), 242, 255.
14. Cf. Lisowsky, 1254; H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12* (Eng. trans. 1991), 284.

קוֹל *qôl*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology; 2. In the Ancient Near East; 3. Occurrences, Versions. II. 1. Acoustic Perception; 2. Natural Sounds, Animals; 3. Utensils, Instruments. III. 1. Human Sounds; 2. Speaking; 3. Interjection. IV. 1. Directing One's Voice to God; 2. God's Voice. V. Qumran.

I. 1. *Etymology.* Etymologically related and semantically comparable noun and verb forms from other Semitic languages include Ugar. *ql,* "voice, sound, thunder"; Phoen. *ql,* "voice, cry"; Aram., Eth. *qāl,* "voice"; Arab. *qāla,* "say"; OSA *qwl,* "steward, advocate," originally "speaker."[1]

The relationship with Akk. *qâlu* and *qūlu* is more difficult to determine since these words are no longer viewed as meaning "say" or "cry,"[2] but rather quite the opposite, namely, "be silent, pay attention," or "quietness, silence."[3] The relationship with words in the other Semitic languages probably derives from a development in which the designation for a certain acoustic perception split semantically into the opposing notions of "generate a sound" on the one hand, and "listen attentively to a sound" on the other. Such development would also explain the use of the Hebrew word as an interjection: *qôl,* approximately "listen,"[4] can mean both "a sound is audible" and "be quiet and listen."

The actual origin of the Hebrew term remains unclear. An etymological connection with *qāhāl,* "assembly," is often suggested[5] but cannot be demonstrated despite its theoretical possibility based on purely phonetic considerations. One must either postulate a hypothetical verb **qāl,* "to call," from which both *qôl* and *qāhāl* developed[6] and yet whose disappearance would be difficult to explain; or one must postulate for the root *qhl,* which in Hebrew has produced only denominative verb forms (niphal, hiphil), an original meaning "to call, summon, assemble," which in its own turn would have pro-

---

qôl. O. Betz, "φωνή κτλ.," *TDNT,* IX, 278-309; idem, "φωνή," *Theologisches Begriffslexikon zum NT,* III, 1436-39; J. L. Cunchillos, "*qôl YHWH* en el AT," *XXX Semana Bíblica Española* (Madrid, 1972) 319-70; M. Dahood, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography IX," *Bibl* 52 (1971) 337-56, esp. 345; A. K. Fenz, *Auf Jahwes Stimme hören. Wiener Beiträge zur Theologie* 6 (1964); C. J. Labuschagne, "קוֹל *qôl* voice," *TLOT,* III, 1132-36, with bibliog.; H. Lesètre, "Voix," *DB,* V, 2449-51; J. Lindblom, "Die Vorstellung vom Sprechen Jahwes zu den Menschen im AT," *ZAW* 75 (1963) 263-88; H. P. Müller, "קָהָל *qāhāl* assembly," *TLOT,* III, 1118-26, esp. 1119 regarding etymology.

1. Cf. *HAL,* III, 1083b; *KBL²,* 831; *WUS,* no. 2407; Biella, 449-50.
2. So *GesB,* 706; *LexHebAram,* 717; *KBL²,* 831.
3. *AHw,* II, 895, 927; *CAD,* XIII, 72-75, 302-3.
4. See III.3 below.
5. Labuschagne, 1133.
6. H. Bauer, "Die hebräischen Eigennamen als sprachliche Erkenntnisquelle," *ZAW* 48 (1930) 75.

duced the (again) hypothetical noun **qahl* from which *qôl* developed by way of *qāl.*[7] It thus seems advisable to begin with the isolated root *qôl,* which as an onomatopoeia meant "sound."

2. *In the Ancient Near East.* Semantically Akk. *rigmu* resembles this Hebrew term.[8] The Akkadian term refers to the voice of people, gods, and demons, though also in a more specific sense to rhetorical speech such as friendly words, complaints, or laments. In a more general sense it can mean "confusion of voices." It refers to "noise, sound," as well as to the sound of musical instruments, the rumbling of an earthquake, the whistling of the wind, and the crackling of fire. Thunder can be perceived as the voice of a god *(ri-ig-ma Adad).*

The Egyp. *ḫrw* refers to the voice of a god, a person (it calls, is loud or soft, can be perceived as pleasant), or an animal (lion, ox, bird, snake).[9] It can replace the more customary word for "say" and introduce direct discourse. It can also refer to "noise and squabbling" among people ("noisemaker" is the equivalent of "enemy"), and can refer in a general sense to acoustic phenomena such as the sound of music and to natural phenomena (thunder, wind).

In Ugaritic, too, the meaning extends from "sound" (*ql,* "thunder," par. *brqm,* "lightning") to "animal sounds" (*lql nhqt ḥmrh,* "the bellowing of a donkey") to a person's voice.[10]

3. *Occurrences, Versions.* The lexeme *qôl* (in isolated instances written defectively as *qōl,* e.g., Gen. 27:22; Ex. 4:8) occurs 486 times in the Hebrew OT and 7 times in the Aramaic portion, not including Jer. 3:9 (*qōl,* defective), which probably means "lightly, loosely";[11] Jer. 46:12, *qālôn,* even though *qôl* is probably the correct reading here (LXX [26:11]; par. *ṣᵉwāḥâ,* "cry"). As the *nomens regens* in a construct expression, *qôl* is associated with words specifying the origin of the phonetic phenomenon (the *qôl* of the horn [Jer. 4:21], of the taskmaster [Job 3:18], of God [Dt. 4:33]), its quality (the *qôl* of joy [Jer. 33:11], fear [30:5]), or its content (the *qôl* of news [10:22], speech [Dt. 4:12], words [Job 33:8]). In the rare instances when *qôl* functions as *nomen rectum,* the *nomen regens* functions adjectivally: *šᵉ'ôn qôlâ,* "its roaring sound" (Jer. 51:55), *yᵉpēh qôl,* "beautiful voice" (Ezk. 33:32), *hôḏ qôlô,* "his majestic voice" (Isa. 30:30), *bᵉrōgez qôlô,* "to his thundering, angry voice" (Job 37:2). In the singular, *qôl* can also refer to a combination of noises and voices, which is why pronominal suffixes are attached only to this form (Josh. 6:10, *qôlᵉḵem,* "your voices"), while the pl. form *qôlôṯ* (also *qôlōṯ* and *qōlōṯ*) has a different meaning: "thunder" (Ex. 9:23-24; 19:16; 20:18; 1 S. 12:17-18; Job 28:26; 38:25) or "rumblings like thunder" (Ps. 93:4). The prefixed preps. *bᵉ*

7. W. F. Albright, "The High Place in Ancient Palestine," *Volume du Congrès, Strasbourg 1956. SVT* 4 (1957), 256.
8. *AHw,* II, 982.
9. *WbÄS,* 324-25.
10. *UT,* no. 2213.
11. See II.1 below.

ple to assemble and rally against an attack. The *qôl biṯrû'â* accompanies preparations for the siege of Jerusalem by the king of Babylon (Ezk. 21:27[22]). The prophet who anticipates war perceives in a vision the *qôl* of the ram's horn (Jer. 4:19,21). Moab dies amid the uproar and shouting of war and amid the sound of the trumpet (Am. 2:2). Those who survive the military catastrophe cannot bear to see war or hear the *qôl* of the trumpet (Jer. 42:14). The war steed waits impatiently for the sound of the trumpet (Job 39:24). The ancient legend tells how the walls of the enemy city crumbled at the *qôl* of the ram's horn (Josh. 6:5,20).

III. 1. *Human Sounds.* Human movement and activity produce a *qôl.* One hears, e.g., when a person enters a room (1 K. 14:6; 2 K. 6:32), walks back and forth distributing water (? Jgs. 5:11), or falls down like a tree (Ezk. 31:16; Jer. 49:21). In an anthropomorphical sense, the movement of heavenly beings or even of the deity himself produces a sound (Ezk. 1:24; 3:12-13; 10:5; 2 S. 5:24; Gen. 3:8,10 may engage in anti-anthropomorphism in that it is not Yahweh who moves about in the garden, but his *qôl*).

Of course, people can use their vocal cords to produce sounds reflecting their physical or psychological condition as well. One hears the *qôl* of a whimpering child (Gen. 21:17), a moaning sick person (Jer. 4:31), of those who weep (Gen. 21:16), groan (Ps. 102:6[5]), lament, beat their breasts, and sob. By contrast, merrymakers (Jer. 30:19) and singers (2 S. 19:36[35]; Cant. 2:14; 8:13; Isa. 51:3; Ezk. 33:32) produce a different *qôl.* The effect of the sounds normally accompanying a person's presence is so crucial that the expression "there is no human *qôl*" (*'ên qôl 'āḏām*) is the equivalent of "no one is there" (*'ên 'îš,* 2 K. 7:10). A gathering of noisy people produces an even stronger version of such sounds. The par. passage 2 Ch. 23:12 enhances the account of the guards and rebellious crowd in 2 K. 11:13 by explaining how the *qôl* also included praises of the king. Descriptions of such collective noise designated as *qôl* reveal the mood of the participants as well as the content of their cries, allowing bystanders to recognize and interpret sounds and noise as the *qôl* of rejoicing (1 Ch. 15:16; Jer. 7:34), joyous proclamation (Ps. 47:2[1]; Isa. 48:20), singing (Ps. 98:5), or as a *qôl* of weeping (Ezr. 3:13; Isa. 65:19), terror (1 S. 4:14; Isa. 65:19), anxiety and fear (Job 15:21; Isa. 24:18), lament (Jer. 9:18[19]), or entreaty (Ps. 28:2,6).

The *qôl* of the crowd can resound at joyous occasions. One stereotypical expression divides this joyous noise into the *qôl* of mirth and the *qôl* of gladness, the *qôl* of the bride and the *qôl* of the bridegroom (Jer. 7:34; 16:9; 25:10; 33:11). The *qôl* of revelers from the Israelite camp meets Moses (Ex. 32:17), and he interprets it as the sound of shameful debauchery (v. 18). The people rejoice so excessively at the newly anointed king "that the earth quaked at their *qôl*" (1 K. 1:40). The ram's horn sounds, and the *qôl* of the city sounds like an uproar (v. 41). Those liberated from exile proclaim their deliverance with a shout of joy (Isa. 48:20). The rejoicing *qôl* produced at the reestablishment of the temple is so great that it can be heard far and wide (Ezr. 3:12-13). In the newly established salvific age, thanksgiving, the *qôl* of song (Isa. 51:3), and the *qôl* of merrymakers (Jer. 30:19) will be heard. The tragedy of historical reality, on the other hand, is accompanied more by the noise accompanying turmoil, war, and their devasta-

Of course, a group can also be the subject of *qôl* to the extent that the people utter the words or songs *qôl 'eḥāḏ*, "with one voice" (Ex. 24:3; Jer. 33:11; 2 Ch. 5:13).

The grammatical construction of Job 29:10 makes it a rather difficult verse, though it is probably saying that the princes held back their own opinions *(qôl)* out of respect.

In certain instances it is difficult to determine whether *qôl* is personified or represents the speaker. In Ps. 44:17(16) *miqqôl mᵉḥārēp̄* means either "at the words of a taunter" or "at taunting words," though the par. ("at the sight [countenance] of the enemy") seems to favor the first alternative (NRSV "at the words of the taunters and revilers"). On the other hand, the expression *qôl maggîḏ* in Jer. 4:15 should probably be translated (cf. the par.), "A voice declares" (whence also "a voice cries out/says," Isa. 40:3,6).[21]

The syntagma *šmʿ qôl* describes an acoustic phenomenon in the sense of "hear a voice" (Gen. 21:17; Ex. 32:17; Lev. 5:1; 2 K. 11:13; Dnl. 8:16); alongside it one also frequently encounters the expression *šmʿ (bᵉ/lᵉ)qôl* in the sense of "obey someone; take someone's advice; follow someone." Of course, here *qôl* refers to the content of the words. "Someone heeds another person's voice": Adam follows the seductive voice of his wife (Gen. 3:17); Abraham accepts the suggestion of his wife (Gen. 16:2); Moses follows the advice of his father-in-law (Ex. 18:19,24); children should obey their parents, pupils their teacher (Gen. 27:8,13,43; Dt. 21:18; Prov. 5:13); the people should follow the instructions of their leader (Josh. 22:2; 1 S. 8:19), though the leader should also sometimes yield to the demands of the people (1 S. 8:7); King Saul is persuaded by his son (1 S. 19:6), and much later, shortly before his death, he listens to the medium (1 S. 28:22) after she unwillingly obeys him (v. 21); members of different tribes should consider their mutual interests (Jgs. 20:13); the Rechabites obey the commandments of their ancestors (Jer. 35:8).[22]

3. *Interjection.* The broad semantic spectrum associated with the term *qôl* also explains its use as an interjection. People suddenly hear sounds, noise, or speaking and express their subsequent attentiveness or solicit that of someone else with the cry "*qôl*!" Biblical scholars, however, do not agree which passages are actually using the term with this meaning, and each instance must be examined individually. Disputed passages include Ps. 118:15; Jer. 3:21; 31:15; 51:54; Mic. 6:9.

The meaning "Listen!" can be demonstrated persuasively only where the sentence construction itself requires it. Gen. 4:10: "*qôl* (sg.), your brother's blood (pl.) is crying out (pl.) to me." Cant. 5:2: "*qôl,* my beloved is knocking" (simpler than "the *qôl* of my beloved is knocking," though that alternative is certainly also possible in poetic language; cf. Cant. 2:8). Isa. 52:8: "Listen! Your sentinels lift up their voices" (double: *qôl . . . qôl*).

IV. 1. *Directing One's Voice to God.* God hears the *qôl* of those who suffer (Gen. 21:17) and who are murdered (Gen. 4:10), though also that of God's adversaries (Ps.

21. See IV.2 below.
22. On the use of this idiom in the religious sphere, see IV.2 below.

What reviewers have said about *TDOT:*

"The *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* is a monumental contribution to the study of the Old Testament, and very highly recommended. No library can afford to be without it." — ***Hebrew Studies***

"Provides a much-needed resource into the language of the Old Testament, particularly as it relates to the ancient Near East. . . . A must for any serious student of the Old Testament." — ***Southwestern Journal of Theology***

"A tool that no Bible student can afford to ignore; it takes its place alongside Kittel as a classic reference work." — ***Christianity Today***

"Students of the Bible have cause for rejoicing as each volume of this scholarly work appears. . . . This 'theological dictionary' focuses on the etymology of Hebrew terms, then explores their cultural and historical contexts, finally suggesting their importance in a theological framework without espousing a particular denominational bias."

— ***American Reference Books Annual***

"An important and interesting scholastic tool, essential for any library that serves serious Bible students, theological scholars, church-school teachers, pastors, or interested laypeople."

— ***Choice***

"*[TDOT]* amasses a great deal of useful information (including bibliography) on the words dealt with, which most scholars would find difficult to ferret out on their own. . . . Clearly, no serious exegete of the Old Testament should overlook it."

— ***Journal of the American Academy of Religion***

"This series will long remain a classic work, a storehouse of information, well organized and carefully judged and nuanced. Every major biblical library should possess it."

— ***The Bible Today***

"Serious students of the Hebrew Bible will find this dictionary a valuable resource."

— ***Journal of Biblical Literature***

ISBN 0-8028-2336-X

9 780802 823366

Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.
Grand Rapids/Cambridge

www.eerdmans.com